



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

EPITOME OF
ANGLICAN
CHURCH HISTORY





AN EPITOME
OF
ANGLICAN CHURCH HISTORY.



AN EPITOME
OF
ANGLICAN CHURCH HISTORY

FROM THE EARLIEST AGES TO THE PRESENT TIME

Compiled from Various Sources

BY ELLEN WEBLEY-PARRY

"The Communion of the Church of England, as it stands distinguished from all Papal and Puritan innovations, and as it adheres to the doctrine of the Cross"

From the Will of Bishop Ken, A.D. 1710



GRIFFITH AND FARRAN
SUCCESSORS TO NEWBERRY AND HARRIS
WEST CORNER OF ST. PAUL'S CHURCHYARD, LONDON
CARMARTHEN: WILLIAM SPURRELL

MDCCCLXXIX

110. m. 765.

TO THE
VENERABLE WILLIAM NORTH, M.A.

ARCHDEACON OF CARDIGAN AND RECTOR OF
LLANGOEDMORE

This Work

IS DEDICATED WITH EVERY SENTIMENT OF ESTEEM
AND RESPECT

BY HIS FRIEND AND PARISHIONER

ELLEN WEBLEY-PARRY

P R E F A C E .

IF it be asked why this book has been written—seeing that so many valuable sketches of various portions of the history of our Church have been published from time to time—I reply that I believe it will be found useful notwithstanding, because I have endeavoured to compress into a small space the leading events of Anglican Church history *as a whole* ; and this may cause it to be acceptable to those who possess neither the opportunity to obtain, nor leisure to peruse, more detailed and voluminous works.

This volume professes no originality : it is simply a compilation. The only merits which I venture to claim are diligence in seeking, and accuracy in relating, the facts recorded. I have in all instances cited my authorities ; and in cases where the subject seemed to require it, I have frequently transcribed the events related as nearly as possible in the words of the author referred to.

I have endeavoured to keep steadily in view the antiquity of our Church and its endowments, the gradual encroachments and errors of the papacy, with the necessity which thereby arose for reformation, and above all the unbroken continuity of our Church from the earliest ages to the present time.

It will be observed that special attention has been given to Wales and its ecclesiastical affairs. The reason is that much misconception prevails respecting that branch of my subject, especially amongst the natives of the principality themselves; but lest the circumstance should be attributed to mere Celtic fervour, I may be permitted to say that I am English by birth and parentage, though a resident in Wales and warmly attached to its interesting people.

To the many kind friends who have placed their libraries at my disposal, my grateful thanks are due. Without that aid the progress of my Work would have been difficult.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

From the First to the Fourth Centuries.

Arrival of the Romans in Britain, B.C. 55. Julius Cæsar's account of the inhabitants. Their religion. The Romans return, A.D. 43. Caractacus. Possible introduction of Christianity. Pompina and Claudia. St. Paul. The date of the introduction of Christianity cannot be ascertained. Diocletian persecution in Britain about A.D. 303. Alban, the first British martyr. Constantine Chlorus. Constantine the Great. Ireland, then known as Scotia. Scotland known as Caledonia or Albania. The Picts' wall *page 1*

CHAPTER II.

Fourth Century.

Constantine becomes a Christian and protects Christianity. Church festivals. Bishops of Antioch, Alexandria, Rome, and Constantinople. Constantine removes the seat of government to Constantinople. Institution of councils and synods. Provincial and general councils. Council of Arles, A.D. 314. British bishops there. Canons passed at Arles. The Arian heresy. Council of Nice, A.D. 325. The Nicene and Athanasian creeds. Baptismal fonts. St. Jerome and St. Ambrose. Tottering state of the Roman empire. Theodosius delivers Britain from the invasion of the Picts, &c. His son Theodosius the Great. The empire becomes divided into that of the East and West. The Roman forces are withdrawn from Britain, A.D. 410. Rome taken by the Goths under Alaric. Progress of the Britons under the Roman sway *page 7*

CHAPTER III.

Fifth Century.

Remarks respecting missionaries from Britain and Scotia. Celestius. Palladius. Fastidius. Ninian. St. Patrick. He founds the bishopric of Armagh. Is called the apostle of Ireland. The isle of Man. Pelagius. His heresy—it is reprov'd by Augustine bishop of Hippo. The heresy brought into Britain, 429. Germanus, bishop of Auxerre. His first visit to Britain. His second visit, 447. The Gallican liturgy. The Church of Gaul confers great benefits on that of Britain. Question of the origin of the latter. Its probable strength and extent previous to the departure of the Romans. The schools of Dyfrig and Illtyd, known under their Latin names of Dubricius and Illutus. The Romans encouraged study. The synod of Vaison. Origin of parochial churches. St. Augustin, and his mother Monica. Devastation of the African Church by the Vandals *page 13*

CHAPTER IV.

Fifth and Sixth Centuries.

State of Britain after the departure of the Romans. Vortigern. Arrival of Hengest and the Jutes in isle of Thanet, A.D. 449. Their settlement in Kent. The Angles. The Saxons. All were kindred tribes. King Arthur. The bards. Llywarch Hên. Taliesin. Myrddin, or Merlin. Aneurin. Lengthened struggle of the Britons against the invaders. The former retain Strathclyde and Cornwall or west Wales, and retire into Wales. Origin of the name of Wales. Predictions of the bards unfulfilled. List of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. Cerdic, the west Saxon, is the founder of our royal line . . . page 18

CHAPTER V.

Fifth and Sixth Centuries.

Origin of monasteries. Anthony their founder. Hermits. Rules of St. Basil. The first in Europe were in Italy and Gaul. They were at first nurseries for the Church and places for study. Differences between the monasteries of the eastern and western churches. Great benefits derived by the British Church from those founded in this century. Advantages of combined action in dealing with the masses, and its renewal in the present day. Dubricius. Caerworgorn, &c. Pawl Hên. Cunedda Wledig. Churches founded in Wales. Family of Brychan. Merthyr-Tydfil. Cynllo. The Scots sail from Scotia to the Mull of Cantyre. They give their name to Scotland. That of Ireland derived from Ierne. Cornwall and St. Piranus. The Goths in Gaul. Attila, king of the Huns. Clovis, king of the Franks, conquers Gaul and becomes a Christian. Leo, bishop of Rome. Final break up of the Roman empire in the west, and rise of the power of the Roman bishops. Dubricius becomes bishop of Caerleon, holds a synod at Brefi, in Cardiganshire, retires to Bardsey island, and dies there, 522. Bishopric of Bangor. St. David. Teilo, bishop of Llandaff. St. Bride. Cadvan. Llanbadarn-fawr. Caergybi or Holyhead. St. Columba. Iona. Bishopric of St. Asaph. Gildas, the historian. The British bishops of London and York retire. Armorica, now Brittany . . . page 23

CHAPTER VI.

Sixth and Seventh Centuries.

Gregory, bishop of Rome. He sends Augustine to Britain, A.D. 597. Ethelbert, king of Kent. His wife Bertha. The ancient British church of St. Martin at Canterbury. Augustine is consecrated archbishop of Canterbury, and receives the pall. His questions and Gregory's replies. Relics. Miracles. Augustine has a conference with the British bishops. His second conference, and haughty behaviour to them. Reply of Dinorth, the abbot of Bangor. Controversy as to the festival of Easter. Massacre of the monks of Bangor, and destruction of their monastery and library. The Gallican liturgy. Ethelbert builds St. Paul's cathedral. Death of Augustine, A.D. 604. Death of Gregory. Successors of Augustine. Edwin, king of Northumbria. War between him and the British prince Cadwallon. Oswald, king of Northumbria. The Irish or Albanian Scots from Iona. Aidan. Finan. Saxon homilies. Oswy, king of Northumbria. Christianity introduced into Mercia and the other Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, chiefly by members of the British Church. The Welsh did not assist in this work. Reasons and excuses for their neglect of this duty page 37

CHAPTER VII.

Seventh and Eighth Centuries.

Oswy, king of Northumbria. Conference at Whitby respecting Easter. Colman and Wilfrid. The abbess Hilda. Bishop Chad. Archbishop Theodore. Sacred music. Death of Oswy. Egfrid succeeds him. Queen Etheldreda founds a religious house at Ely. Death of Egfrid. Alfrid, king of Northumbria. Bishop Wilfrid. St. John of Beverley. Synod of Hatfield. Settlement of the question of Easter. Parochial clergy. Origin of patronage. Death of Theodore, A.D. 690. Foundation of churches. Ireland. Her missionaries, Columbanus and others. Love of learning in Ireland. Benedict Biscop. Aldhelm. The venerable Bede. His death, A.D. 735. Egbert, archbishop of York. Penances. The Anglo-Saxon witenagemot or parliament. Ina, king of the west Saxons. His ecclesiastical laws. Assembly of the kingdom of Kent at Becanceld. Ina institutes church-shot. Origin of church rates. Ina retires to Rome, and dies there. His school in Rome. Tithes. Anglo-Saxon coronation oath. Church and state page 51

CHAPTER VIII.

Eighth Century (continued).

Willibrod. Winfrid (or Boniface), the "apostle of Germany," killed A.D. 753. Virgilius. Villehad. Synod of Cloveshoo. Origin of churchyards. Celibacy. Increase of monasteries. Relics. Pilgrimages. Prayers for the dead. Increasing power of the Roman see. Controversy on image worship. Leo, emperor of the east, and Gregory II., who may be called the first pope of Rome. Council of Constantinople, A.D. 754. Pepin, king of the Franks. He defeats the Lombards and gives territories to the pope. Mohammedanism. Its rise and progress. Charles Martel checks their advance beyond Spain, A.D. 737. Charlemagne. He confirms the grants made by Pepin to the Roman see. The empress Irene. The second council of Nice, A.D. 786. Britain protests against image-worship. Charlemagne assembles a council at Frankfort, A.D. 794. Alcuin. The Caroline books. Charlemagne is proclaimed emperor of the west, A.D. 800. State of learning in Ireland. Offa, king of Mercia. He builds a church and monastery at St. Alban's; visits Rome, and makes a further provision for Ina's school in that city. This provision is afterwards called Peter's pence. Restoration of St. Alban's abbey, and recent discovery of St. Alban's shrine. The Welsh. Offa's dyke. Rise of errors in the Church. Monastic life page 65

CHAPTER IX.

Ninth Century.

Anglo-Saxon learning. The dark ages. Increasing influence of the popes. Egbert, king of the west Saxons. He unites under himself the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. The Danes, Northmen, or Sea Kings. Egbert dies, A.D. 836; is succeeded by his son Ethelwulf. He visits Rome with his son Alfred. His charter to the Church, A.D. 855. Remarks on tithe. Alfred the Great. Landing of Danes in east Anglia, A.D. 866. Their cruelties, and destruction of the monasteries of Croyland, Peterborough, and Ely. Alfred becomes king, A.D. 871. He takes refuge in the island of Athelney. Defeats the Danes. Settles them in east Anglia. Alfred's navy. He forms counties and hundreds. Founds Winchester. Asser. Grimbold. John Scotus Erigena. His treatise against the rising error of transubstantiation. St. Neots. Alfred's letter to Wulfsig, bishop of London. University of Oxford. Alfred's character and attainments. His death, A.D. 900. The papal power continues to increase. The forged decretals. Scotland. The see of St. Andrews. Synod at Scone. The Danes in Wales. Roderic Mawr. Synods at Llandaff. Ireland. Its troubles from the invasions of Danes. Their ravages at Armagh page 80

CHAPTER X.

Tenth Century.

Edward the elder succeeds Alfred. The Scotch and Welsh submit to him. The Scotch synod at Forfar. Anglo-Saxon laws. Athelstan. He effectually checks the Danes. Howel Dda. His synod at Whitland, in South Wales, and code of laws. His death, A.D. 948. Dunstan. The Benedictine monks. The first Benedictine establishment is formed in England at Glastonbury, and Dunstan becomes its abbot. King Edmund grants him great privileges. Edwin and Elgiva. Their misfortunes and death. Edgar. He aids Dunstan to extend the rule of the Benedictines. Dunstan becomes archbishop of Canterbury. He obtains the king's assistance to eject the clergy from the monasteries. The "secular" and "regular" clergy. Dunstan's power. Tithes and church dues. A national Church. Ecclesiastical laws. Confession. Edgar's grant of the Lothians to Kenneth, king of the Scots. Death of Edgar, A.D. 975. The abbot of Croyland and church bells. Introduction of the practice of naming and blessing them page 93

CHAPTER XI.

Tenth and Eleventh Centuries.

Edward the Martyr succeeds Edgar. Council at Calne respecting the ejected clergy. Ethelred. His queen Emma, daughter of the duke of Normandy. The Danes again troublesome. Bishopric of Llandaff. Death of Dunstan, A.D. 989. Purgatory. Homilies of archbishop Elfric. Increase in the orders of the Church. Fresh invasions of the Danes. Malcolm II. of Scotland. Alphage, archbishop of Canterbury, killed by the Danes. Invasion of Sweyn, king of Denmark, A.D. 1013. Ethelbert retires to Normandy, returns, fights with Canute, and dies in London. Edmund Ironside. His death. Canute becomes king. His sons succeed. The Saxon line is restored. Edward the Confessor, A.D. 1042. His love of Norman customs. Stigand, archbishop of Canterbury. Dioceses formed in Scotland in the time of Malcolm III. Edward sends for the children of his brother, Edmund Ironside. Harold, son of Godwine, earl of Kent, subdues the Welsh. Westminster abbey. Edward's death. Harold succeeds him, though Edgar, the Atheling, was the rightful heir of the royal line page 101

CHAPTER XII.

Eleventh Century (continued).

Origin of parishes. Churches in Wales. Dates of foundation of various monasteries. Charter of Edward the Confessor to Westminster abbey. Advowson. Patronage. Tithes. Dates of foundation of some of our cathedrals. Right of the Church to her endowments. Election of bishops. Marriage. Observance of Sunday. Independence of the Anglo-Saxon Church. State of Wales. Increase in the papal power, especially after pope Leo IX., A.D. 1049. page 109

CHAPTER XIII.

Eleventh Century (continued).

The Northmen or Normans. Rollo, the first duke of Normandy. William, duke of Normandy. He claims the English crown, invades England, defeats Harold, the Saxon king, who is slain at the battle of Hastings, A.D. 1066. Battle Abbey built. The men of Kent. The Anglo-Saxons deprived of their property. Edgar the Atheling. Malcolm III. of Scotland. He marries Mar-

garet, sister of Edgar. Important results of this union. Her character. The feudal system. The Anglo-Saxons oppressed by the Normans. The first papal legate. Lanfranc made archbishop of Canterbury in place of the Anglo-Saxon Stigand. The Danish bishops in Ireland come to Canterbury to be consecrated. Lanfranc's devotion to the papal see. William arrests and imprisons his brother Odo. Earldom of Cornwall. The ancient Cornish bishopric now revived page 117

CHAPTER XIV.

Eleventh Century (continued).

The popes acquire increased power. Nicholas II. confirms Robert Guiscard in his possession of Sicily, and changes the mode of electing the popes. The college of cardinals. Pope Gregory VII. (Hildebrand). He desires William I. to do homage for the crown of England, which he refuses. The Peter pence appropriated by the popes. Henry IV., emperor of Germany. His treatment by Gregory. Death of Gregory. William invades Wales, A.D. 1079, and visits St. David's. The Anglo-Saxon saints. The French language. The king's love of the chase. The New Forest. William encourages learning. He grants privileges to the clergy. Domesday book. The Scottish bishops still come to York for consecration. William's death and character. Archbishop Lanfranc rebuilds Canterbury cathedral, and writes in favour of transubstantiation. His death. William II. His tyranny. Appoints Anselm archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 1093. The Sarum liturgy. The Crusades. Peter the Hermit. Godfrey crowned king of Jerusalem. State of Wales. The Norman barons gains settlements there, and build castles. The lords of the Marches. Death of William II. State of Britain at that time. The Anglo-Saxon Church, its endowments and its independence of Rome. Its national character and unbroken descent to the present day page 127

CHAPTER XV.

Twelfth Century.

Henry I. succeeds to the throne, A.D. 1100. His Saxon queen Matilda. Robert Duke of Normandy imprisoned in Cardiff castle. Henry's dispute with the pope about investitures. Thomas, archbishop of York. Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury. His death and character. His advice to Alexander, king of Scotland. The Norman barons gain further possessions in Wales. The Flemings settle in Pembrokeshire. Richard Strongbow. He is made earl of Pembroke. Martin de Tours. Norman clergy introduced into Wales. The pope's letters of complaints to Henry. Henry's death. Stephen. Henry II. succeeds, A.D. 1154. Worship of the Virgin Mary. Intercession of saints. The church services conducted in Latin. Thomas à Becket made archbishop of Canterbury. The constitutions of Clarendon. Quarrels between Henry and Becket. The interdict described. Becket returns to England. He is murdered at Canterbury. His shrine in the cathedral there. Pilgrimages made to it page 137

CHAPTER XVI.

Twelfth Century (continued).

Pope Adrian IV. Henry obtains possession of Ireland, and makes Strongbow, who had married an Irish princess, governor of that country. The Danish bishops in Ireland. Synod of Cashel. The Irish Church reformed on the Romish pattern. Henry does penance at Becket's shrine, and submits to many of the pope's demands. Giraldus Cambrensis chosen by the Welsh as

bishop of St. David's. Henry refuses his consent, and appoints a Norman. Increase of the power of the popes. Alexander III. His disputes with the emperor Frederick. The third council of the Lateran, A.D. 1179. Changes the form of the papal election. Explanation of the word 'mass.' The Scotch Church places itself under the protection of Rome. Death of Henry II. Sketch of the Norman progress in England. Richard I. succeeds, A.D. 1189. He goes to the Holy Land. The orders of St. John and the Templars. Indulgences and works of supererogation. The Waldenses or Vaudois *page* 147

CHAPTER XVII.

Thirteenth Century.

John becomes king, A.D. 1199. Giraldus again chosen as bishop of St. David's. His election is again disallowed. Bishops now chosen by the chapters of cathedrals. Canons secular and regular described. John's nephew Arthur. Richard, archbishop of Canterbury. Complaints of decay of discipline in monasteries. Stephen Langton becomes archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 1207. John quarrels with pope Innocent III. The interdict and excommunication. Philip Augustus, king of France, prepares to invade England. Pandulphus, the pope's legate. John resigns his crown to the pope, and agrees to pay him tribute. He is absolved by the archbishop. The barons extort Magna Charta from the king. He tries to evade it. The pope takes his part. His death. Normandy gained by the French. John Comyn, archbishop of Dublin, builds the cathedral of St. Patrick. Scot, bishop of Dunkeld. The power of the pope at its greatest height. The fourth Lateran council held by Innocent III., A.D. 1215. Transubstantiation, auricular confession, and celibacy of the clergy confirmed there. The mendicant friars. The four orders described. Origin of the inquisition *page* 156

CHAPTER XVIII.

Thirteenth Century (continued).

Henry III., A.D. 1216. Death of the archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 1228. Avarice of the Roman see. Discontent of the clergy and laity at the money levied by the pope. The council of Lyons and pope Innocent IV., A.D. 1245. The pope's disputes with the emperor of Germany. The eastern or Greek Church. Increasing power and influence of the friars. The barons and bishops complain to pope Innocent of the intrusion of foreign clergy, and to pope Alexander of "appropriations" and patronage. Grostête, bishop of Lincoln. Sewal. State of Wales. Llewelyn ab Iorwerth. He holds a meeting of Welsh chieftains at Strata Florida. The king again swears to observe Magna Charta, but fails to do so. The barons, headed by the earl of Leicester, rebel. Prince Edward defeats Leicester, who is killed. The prince goes to the Holy Land, A.D. 1270. National synod in London. Canons passed there. Westminster abbey rebuilt in this reign. Death of Henry III., A.D. 1272. Increase of learning. Louis IX. of France. Roger Bacon . . . *page* 166

CHAPTER XIX.

Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries.

Edward I. His wars with the Welsh. Death of Llewelyn, prince of Wales, 1281, and execution of his brother David, 1283. Edward finally subdues Wales, and introduces English laws, and divides North Wales into counties. Some account of the Welsh bards. Edward's edict against them. Dissensions amongst the Welsh had checked their advance in civilization, &c. Edward erects Carnarvon castle. His son born there, and receives the title of prince of Wales. Edward's wars with Scotland. Reasons for the claims to homage.

Robert Bruce. Pope Celestine V. He resigns. Boniface VIII. succeeds, 1294. He directs the clergy to pay no taxes, but Edward insists on it. Duty of the clergy in this matter. First-fruits and tenths. Statute of Mortmain. Further advance of parliamentary representation, and increasing importance of the house of commons. Houses of convocation. The Jews. Edward II. succeeds. He is much governed by favourites. Edward III. He and his son, the Black Prince. The wars with Scotland and France. Edward and his parliament protest against the usurpations of the Church of Rome and the mendicant friars. Bradwardine, the king's chaplain and confessor. Fitzralph, archbishop of Armagh. Great influence of the Dominicans and Franciscans. Ill-feeling between the secular and religious clergy. Pope Urban V. demands the tribute and homage promised by king John, which is refused by both king and parliament, and they protest against the pope's exactions. John Wycliffe, his opinions supported by John of Gaunt. Death of Edward III. Act of præmunire in reign of Richard II.; it had been passed by Edward III. Wycliffe's writings and translation of the Bible. Transubstantiation formally adopted by the English Church. Wycliffe's death and character. Queen of Richard II. The Scriptures withheld from the people. William of Wykeham. Greek and Latin churches. The dogma of the immaculate conception. Death of Richard II. Succeeded by Henry IV. Persecuting statute. Sawtree, the first martyr burned in England. Improprations. Opinions of the Lollards. Arundel, archbishop of Canterbury, holds a synod at Oxford. Wycliffe's books condemned, 1410. The last insurrection of the Welsh under Owen Glendower. *page 177*

CHAPTER XX.

Fifteenth Century.

Henry V. Council of Constance, 1414. John Huss burned, also Jerome of Prague. The council justifies the breach of their safe conduct. Denial of the cup to the laity in the communion. The council condemns Wycliffe's tenets, and directs his bones to be dug up, which is done. Rival popes and councils. Council of Constance dissolved, 1418. Council of Basle or Basil. Pope Eugenius IV. holds another at Florence. Vain attempts to reconcile the Greek and Latin churches. Constantinople taken by the Turks, 1453. Persecution in England. Sir John Oldcastle (lord Cobham) arrested for holding Wycliffe's opinions. His examination. Condemned to death as a heretic. Escapes into Wales. Afterwards accused of treason. Taken prisoner and burned. The people's desire to study Scripture. Death of Henry V. His widow marries Sir Owen Tudor. Henry VI. His weak character. Wars of the roses begin. Battle of Barnet, 1471. Henry imprisoned, and afterwards killed. Death of Warwick, and of Edward, prince of Wales. Queen Margaret retires to France. Duke of York succeeds as Edward IV. Art of printing introduced by Caxton. Scotland. James I. assassinated. Kennedy, bishop of St. Andrews, founds the college there. Scottish Church declared independent of the see of York. Death of Edward IV. Edward V. and his brother murdered in the Tower, and their uncle, Richard of Gloucester, succeeds as Richard III. Henry Tudor, earl of Richmond, defeats him at Bosworth, where Richard is killed. Henry mounts the throne as Henry VII. Marries Elizabeth of York. Perkin Warbeck. James IV. of Scotland marries Henry's daughter Margaret. Death of Arthur, prince of Wales. Henry VII. dies, 1509. Margaret Beaufort founded St. John's college, Cambridge. *page 196*

CHAPTER XXI.

Sixteenth Century.

Henry VIII. Sketch of religious society from the Norman invasion. Increase of learning, and study of the Scriptures. Popularity of Henry VIII. His contemporaries. Leo X. Sale of indulgences by Tetzel. Luther's disgust at the

proceedings. Cardinal Wolsey. Henry VIII. writes in defence of the papal doctrines. Receives the title of defender of the faith. Erasmus. Study of Greek revived. Dean Colet. Founds St. Paul's school. Tyndal's translation of the New Testament. Toustal, bishop of London, burns the copies. Henry's divorce. Delays respecting it. Wolsey's fall. Rise of Cranmer. His learning, and opinion as to the divorce. Made archbishop of Canterbury. Convocation of the English Church. The royal supremacy. Henry marries Anne Boleyn. Appeals to Rome forbidden. The annates or first-fruits forbidden to be paid to Rome. Persecuting statute of Henry IV. partly repealed. Election of bishops. Explanation of *præmunire*. Convocation disclaims the pope's authority. The annates given to the king. Bishop Fisher executed. The pope's bull excommunicating Henry, &c. Execution of Sir Thomas More. Coverdale's Bible. Cranmer's or the great Bible. Dissolution of the smaller monasteries. Anne Boleyn beheaded. The greater monasteries dissolved. Remarks on the monastic system. Poverty and crime increased. Poor rates established afterwards. The abbey lands come into the king's possession, and are given and sold to laymen, thus introducing the lay appropriations. Archbishop Cranmer wishes Henry to bestow the lands for educational and charitable purposes. The charity lands and chapels. Suffragan bishops. Five bishoprics founded. The primer of Henry VIII. Gardiner, bishop of Winchester. The six articles. The king's attachment to the archbishop. Sacrifice of life in this reign. Our reformed Church not a new Church. Her endowments arose from private benevolence, not from the state. Persecution in Scotland. James V. and cardinal Beaton. Foundation of the order of Jesuits. Their rules. Their missions. Henry's death. His character page 204

CHAPTER XXII.

Sixteenth Century (continued).

Edward VI. His learning and piety. Duke of Somerset made protector. The Church still plundered. Somerset house built. The first book of homilies. Marriage of the clergy declared lawful. Church catechism. The first prayer book of Edward VI. Tables take the place of altars. Gardiner and Bonner imprisoned. Spoliation and pillage of the Church continued. Erastian views of the king and his government. Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr come into England. John Alaski. Bishop Hooper and the episcopal robes. Cranmer wishes to call a synod of the reformed churches. The articles of religion published. The council of Trent assembles under pope Paul III., 1546. A comparison of its doctrines with our articles. The origin of the term 'protestant.' The continuity of the English Church. The second prayer book of Edward VI. Moderation of our reformers. The middle path. Death and character of Edward VI. He founded Christ's hospital and others. Unsettled state of the country during his reign. He leaves the crown to his cousin lady Jane Grey. Remarks of a writer of that day. Mary's claim to the throne is preferred by the nation, and she becomes queen. The duke of Northumberland beheaded, also lady Jane and lord Guildford Dudley. The queen marries Philip II. of Spain. She restores Romanism. Cardinal Pole comes as papal legate. Mary restores the tenths, &c., to the Church. Religious persecution begins. The queen's confessor, Carranza, and his doings at Oxford. John Rogers, the first martyr, February, 1555. Bishop Hooper. Doctor Rowland Taylor. Bishop Ferrar. Bishops Ridley and Latimer, and archbishop Cranmer, examined at Oxford on the doctrine of transubstantiation, and condemned to death. Ridley's farewell letter. He and Latimer burned October, 1555. Death of Gardiner. Bonner continues the persecution. Cranmer again examined, and degraded from his office of archbishop. Removed to the house of the dean of Christchurch, is induced to signed a recantation. His execution still resolved on. He makes a public confession of the reformed faith. His martyrdom, March, 1556. Cardinal Pole succeeds him as archbishop. Death of Mary, 1558 page 226

CHAPTER XXIII.

Sixteenth Century (continued).

Reformation in Scotland. Luxury of the clergy and turbulent character of the nobility. Patrick Hamilton burned for heresy, 1528. Remarks of John Lindsay. Cardinal Beaton becomes archbishop of St. Andrews, 1539. Death of James V. His infant daughter Mary succeeds him. The earl of Arran made regent. Henry VIII. proposes a union between the young queen and his son Edward. George Wishart. Cardinal Beaton continues to persecute the reformers. He is assassinated, 1546, and the murderers remain in the castle of St. Andrews. They afterwards retire to France, and with them John Knox. Remarks on episcopacy and the feelings of the Scotch reformers. The widow of James V., Mary of Guise, becomes regent. The infant queen is sent to France for education, and afterwards marries the son of the French king. John Knox returns in 1555. He preaches against the mass. Bond drawn up in 1557 by the lords of the congregation. They direct the prayer book of Edward VI. to be used. The queen regent makes promises which she does not fulfil. Knox preaches at Perth, and excites the people, who destroy monasteries and deface churches, &c. Civil war breaks out. Knox preaches at St. Andrews, and more destruction occurs. Death of the queen regent, 1560. Ireland. State of that country after its subjection to England. The Anglo-Norman settlers and the native chiefs. The papal power introduced there by the English conquerors. The earl of Kildare succeeded as lord-deputy by the earl of Surrey in the reign of Henry VIII. Unsatisfactory state of the Irish Church. Ireland renounces the papal supremacy, and acknowledges that of the king. The Irish parliament passes various acts relating to ecclesiastical affairs. The first prayer book of Edward VI. adopted by the Irish convocation, and used in Dublin cathedral, Easter, 1551, but it was not translated into the Irish language. The archbishop of Dublin and other prelates deprived of their sees by queen Mary, and Romanizing bishops take their places. The persecution in Mary's reign did not reach Ireland page 246

CHAPTER XXIV.

Sixteenth Century (continued).

Elizabeth ascends the throne of England. Her difficulties and prudence. Pope Paul IV. refuses to acknowledge her. Persecution in England ceases. Excitement amongst Romanists and reformers. The second prayer book of Edward VI. examined by a committee of divines. The queen crowned by the bishop of Carlisle. The act of supremacy. Injunctions published wherein this is explained. Cardinal Pole dies directly after queen Mary. Parliament and convocation meet. A conference in Westminster abbey between the Romanist and reformed divines, which fails. The high commission court. The four first general councils adhered to by the English Church. Act of uniformity for divine worship. The prayer book brought into use on St. John Baptist's day, 1560. The Romanist bishops decline to take the oath of supremacy, and are deprived. The emperor's request that they may have churches in the chief towns is declined. The tenths, &c., restored to the crown. Doctor Matthew Parker appointed archbishop of Canterbury. His consecration. Other sees filled up. The clergy did not come into the reformation reluctantly, but poverty and other causes occasioned a difficulty in finding educated persons for the ministry. Some account of the English reformed exiles at Frankfort and other places. Their disputes about the liturgy. Calvin's influence; also that of Knox. Doctor Richard Cox comes to Frankfort. The exiles return to England, and object to some of the vestments and ceremonies of the Church. Origin of the term 'puritan.' The divisions fomented by Jesuits, who come to England in disguise. Pope Pius IV. His letters to the queen. His legate is not allowed to land in England. Various Jesuit priests travel about the

country, and increase the divisions amongst the reformers. In 1563 the thirty-nine articles of religion pass through convocation and parliament. The second book of homilies printed. The queen's reply to a letter from the Romanist bishops. Archbishop Parker's fitness for his position. The mode in which intercourse was carried on amongst the primitive churches. Difference between the English and continental reformers. Protestants invited to attend the renewed sittings of council of Trent. Elizabeth declines and gives her reasons. The "bishops' Bible" published. Pope Pius V. excommunicates the queen, and absolves her subjects from their allegiance. The Romanist attended the parish churches for the first ten years of this reign. The colleges of Douay and St. Omer founded by Philip II., and a college at Rome by Gregory XIII. Many Jesuit priests sent from thence into England. Bishop Jewel. His sermons at Paul's cross. His "Apology for the Church of England." His sermon at Paul's cross, 1559. The English Reformation was now completed. Scotland. Proceedings of parliament after the death of Mary of Guise. The first book of discipline, in which Knox institutes superintendents in place of bishops. The Geneva form of prayer used instead of the prayer book of Edward VI. Queen Mary becomes a widow, and returns to Scotland in 1561. Destruction of ecclesiastical edifices under the direction of the earl of Argyle, &c. Knox's behaviour to Mary. The populace break into the royal chapel at Holyrood. The queen marries lord Darnley. His death. She marries Bothwell. Civil war. Mary's troops are defeated. She is taken prisoner by the confederated lords, and taken to Lochleven castle. Compelled to resign her crown in favour of her infant son, James VI. Earl of Murray made regent. Mary escapes from Lochleven, but her troops are defeated by the regent's forces, and she flies into England. The Scotch parliament abolishes the Romish services and the authority of the pope. The regents Murray and Lennox assassinated. General assembly of the kirk at Leith, 1572. The titles of archbishop and bishop restored. The regent Mar dies, 1572. Death of Knox in the same year. His character. . . . page 256

CHAPTER XXV.

Sixteenth Century (continued).

Persecution in France and the Netherlands. The massacre on St. Bartholomew's day in France in 1572. Some of the Huguenots escape to England. They are at length protected by the "edict of Nantes" in 1594. Reception of the French ambassador at Elizabeth's court after the massacre. Elizabeth's dangerous position as protector of the persecuted reformers. Death of archbishop Parker. His character. He was hated by the puritans. The English Church opposed by two parties—Romanists and puritans. Mary, queen of Scots, a rallying point to the Romanists. Babington's conspiracy, which proved fatal to her. She is executed in 1587. Philip II. of Spain and the Spanish armada. It is completely destroyed. The anabaptists Munzer and John of Leyden. Menno Simon corrects their excesses. They obtain a settlement in Holland from William, prince of Orange, and publish a confession of faith in 1626. They come into England in Elizabeth's reign, and are called baptists. The Romanists separate from the English Church after the bull of pope Pius V. in 1569. "Seminary" priests come from the colleges of Douay, &c. Their treasonable practices cause severe measures to be adopted by the Government. The Romish practices of re-baptism and re-ordination are comparatively modern. The puritans cause trouble and dissention. They are encouraged by the earl of Leicester. Grindal succeeds Parker as archbishop of Canterbury. His previous career and character. The "prophesyings." Differences between the queen and Whitgift respecting them. Letter from the latter to Elizabeth. Death of Grindal, 1583. Progress of sacred music in this reign. Cartwright and the puritans at Cambridge. Whitgift made archbishop of Canterbury. His letter to the queen respecting Church property. The severe measures against the Romanists chiefly employed in self-defence. Writings of Martin Marprelate. Cartwright's "admonitions." His regret later in life for causing

divisions. Robert Brown, the first seceder from the English Church in 1583. He afterwards returns, but the schism remained, and is the supposed origin of the independents. The "Lambeth articles." Scotland after the death of Knox. Avarice of the regent Morton. Andrew Melville. James VI. takes the reins of government. The second book of discipline, which is not agreed to by the king or parliament. Melville and his friends resolve to put down episcopacy. Weakness of the government. Assembly at Dundee, 1580, abolishes episcopacy. Erskine of Dun and others. The king desires the ministers to pray for his mother previous to her execution in 1587. The presbyterian form and the second book of discipline ratified by the king and parliament. Some reasons for the violent ecclesiastical changes in Scotland. Education is encouraged by the reformation. The first edition of the Bible published in Scotland in 1579. The Romanist nobles. Their conduct in 1593. Violence of Andrew Melville, his speech to the king, and claims of the presbyterian ministers. Politics much mixed up with the Scottish reformation. Ireland. Reasons why the reformation did not make progress there. Poverty of the reformed church. Neglect in translating the Scriptures into Irish. Activity of Romish agents. The king of Spain also assists the malcontents. The insurrection under the earl of Desmond, and afterwards that of the earl of Tyrone. The pope's nuncio and his exhortations. The insurrection suppressed at last after great misery. Lenient measures adopted. Wales. The ignorance and Romanism of the people. Translation of the Scriptures delayed. New Testament translated by bishop Davies. Translation of the Bible completed by bishop Morgan. Naval enterprise in this reign leads to British settlements in Virginia. Death of Philip II. Elizabeth's protection of the French and Flemish refugees. Their church in the crypt of Canterbury cathedral. Death and character of Elizabeth. The puritans and their feelings towards the English Church page 273

CHAPTER XXVI.

Seventeenth Century.

Accession of James I. Remarks on the state of government, and account of the star chamber and high commission courts. The puritans present a petition. Hampton court conference arranged by the king between the puritan and other divines. Doctor Reynolds's objections to various ceremonies answered by archbishop Whitgift and bishop Bancroft. Slight alteration made in the rubrics, and some prayers added. A new translation of the Bible. Remarks on its excellence and value. Death of Whitgift. Canons framed by convocation. Bancroft becomes archbishop. The new race of puritans. Bancroft strict as to the rubrics. Discontent of the Romanists. The gunpowder plot. Severe measures adopted towards them in consequence. The pope's brief respecting the oath of allegiance. James wishes for union between Scotland and England. He summons some of the Scotch episcopalians and presbyterians to attend him at Hampton court. The interview unsatisfactory. Andrew Melville sent to the Tower. A general assembly at Glasgow, which re-establishes episcopacy. The archbishop of Glasgow and two other prelates come to England for consecration. Remarks on the assembly at Glasgow. Their acts confirmed by Scotch Parliament. The king visits Edinburgh. Convocation of the clergy at Perth. The five articles passed there. Death and character of archbishop Bancroft. Bishop Andrews wished for as his successor, but the king selects Abbot, bishop of London. Marriage of the king's eldest daughter to the elector Palatine. Unwillingness of the house of commons to grant supplies. The "impositions" which are declared legal by the judges. The king wishes the prince of Wales to marry the infanta of Spain. Unpopularity of the match. The thirty years war begins, 1618. The elector Palatine elected king of Bohemia. The English wish to support the German reformers, and assist the king of Bohemia. The monopolies. The Spanish match broken off. The parliament of 1624 will only vote small supplies. A marriage arranged between the prince of Wales and the princess Henrietta

Maria of France. Burning of two anabaptists. James puts forth the book of sports, which is disapproved by Abbot, and is not pressed. The Channel islands. Ireland. Insurrection of the earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnell. Unsettled state of the country. James extends the English laws beyond the pale, revives the circuits, and divides the kingdom into counties. Ulster suffers greatly from the rebellion. The king colonizes it with Scotch settlers, and some go from London. The presbyterian and puritan element is thus introduced. Londonderry built. Poverty of the clergy. Spoliation of the Church by the leading laymen and by puritans. The king endows five schools, and gives grants to Trinity college. An Irish parliament called. The Romanists exert themselves to return men of their own party to it. Various causes which checked the reformation. The Romanist oath taken at confession. Wales. Bishop Parry's edition of the Bible in 1620. The Rev. Rhys Pritchard, vicar of Llandovery, and his book, *Canryll y Cymry*. Death of James I . page 296

CHAPTER XXVII.

Seventeenth Century (continued).

Accession of Charles I., 1625. His marriage. The house of commons refuses to vote adequate supplies to carry on the war. Parliament dissolved. Second parliament, 1628. Crown dependent on parliament for money. Forced loans. Queen's French attendants dismissed. Third parliament, 1628. Sir John Eliot and Sir Thomas Wentworth. Petition of right. Duke of Buckingham assassinated. Religious affairs. Puritans. The independents or separatists (now called congregationalists). They went to America, and founded the state of Massachusetts, or New England. Puritans in house of commons. Calvinistic doctrines. Doctor Montague. Letter of three bishops concerning his case. The committee of religion, headed by Pym. Declaration prefixed to the 39 articles. Doctor Mainwaring. The commons accuse the bishops of making innovations. Tonnage and poundage. Privilege. Civil and ecclesiastical affairs closely connected in this reign. The king's attachment to the Church. Laud, bishop of London, now directs state affairs. Sketch of church affairs for last 70 years, till close of Abbot's primacy. Sketch of Laud's life and character. State of diocese of St. David's when he became bishop in 1621. Mistake in the king's marriage to a Romanist. Laud made bishop of London in 1628. His sermon on the opening of the 3rd parliament. Origin of the term 'Arminianism.' Pym and Sir John Eliot. The commons' declaration. Parliament dissolved. Sir John Eliot and others imprisoned. Sir John Eliot dies in the Tower in 1632. Remarks on him, and the state of affairs. The patriots and the puritans. Falkland, Wentworth, Hyde. Charles governs without a parliament for eleven years. Laud and Wentworth his chief counsellors. Remarks on Wentworth and Laud. First five years peaceable. Association for buying lay impropriations for puritan lecturers. The feoffees prosecuted. The project checked. "Tuning the pulpits." Scotland, 1633. Charles goes there. He founds the parish schools, and passes an act, called the "surrenders," to assist the income of the parochial clergy. He intended to arrange a provision for the prelates. The nobles who had obtained church property resent this. Bishopric of Edinburgh founded. Intention of James I. to introduce the English liturgy; it was not generally carried out. James was careful in selection of Scotch bishops. English liturgy slightly altered to meet Scotch jealousy. The Scotch communion office. The king returns to Greenwich. Death of archbishop Abbot. Laud succeeds him. Clarendon's remarks on Laud. The book of sports again introduced. Observations on the observance of the Lord's day. Revival of the regulation that no person should receive orders without a title. Montague and Mainwaring were made bishops. Laud was not Romanizing, but wished to restore order and solemnity to the cathedrals and their services. He restores Lambeth chapel. Is too harsh and impetuous. The ship money, 1634, opposed by Hampden. Prynne's libels. Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton put in the pillory. Ireland. Many Romanist prelates and priests there. Their boldness. Usher, arch-

bishop of Armagh. Sir Thomas Wentworth made lord deputy of Ireland. His firm government. He improves the state of the Church, establishes the linen trade, checks Romanist and puritan aggression. The system of "thorough." Its defects. Ireland benefited much by his rule. He is recalled by Charles in 1640 to aid him in England page 313

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Seventeenth Century (continued).

Scotland in 1637. Introduction of the liturgy on 16th of July. Riots in Edinburgh; they were encouraged by the nobles. Opinions of principal Baillie on the subject. The national covenant. An assembly and a parliament demanded. The marquis of Hamilton is sent as deputy by the king. All reasonable conditions are refused. Wish to deprive the bishops of their seats at the council board, and attack on their characters. The assembly elected, 1638. Majority obtained by the covenanters. The king's concessions not accepted. The king's proclamation. The assembly condemns episcopacy, releases ministers from their oath to their bishops, deposes and excommunicates the archbishops and bishops, and prohibits churchmen from holding civil appointments. Alexander Henderson. He is the moderator of this assembly. No books of controversy allowed to be printed without leave of the assembly. The covenant ordered to be signed by all persons. Bishops retire from Scotland. This ecclesiastical change brought about by lay influence; the motives being envy and fear. Remarks on this assembly of 1638. The liturgy introduced unwisely. The Scotch army, under general Lesley, crosses the border in 1639. Sermons delivered at head quarters. The king meets them with troops, but a treaty is entered into. An assembly and parliament meet in Edinburgh, in 1640, but war is determined on. The English puritans encourage this. The king sends for Wentworth from Ireland, and creates him earl of Strafford. He and Laud advise the king to call a parliament. It meets in April, 1640. Charles promises to give up ship money, &c., if supplies are granted. The commons decline, and make fresh attacks on the Church. Parliament is dissolved, after sitting for twenty-three days. The Scotch presbyterians and the puritans are coming to an agreement in religious matters. The Scotch army seizes Durham and Newcastle. Troops from Ireland are ready to come over, but a treaty is entered into. The counties of Northumberland and Durham remain in the hands of the Scotch, and their army is paid £850 per day while it remains there. Convocation continued to sit after the short parliament was dissolved; it voted subsidies to the crown, and altered some canons, made one against Socinianism, and another against innovations in church doctrines and government, called, the 'et cetera oath.' The archbishop's house at Lambeth is attacked, and convocation threatened. Parliament again summoned in November, 1640, which is the long parliament. Its feeling against the Church. The commons appoint a committee for removing "scandalous ministers." They delay giving money to the Scotch army. Lord Strafford comes to London. His trial begins in March, 1641. The Irish remonstrance against Strafford. The commons proceed by bill of attainder. Condemned to death. Popular clamour for the royal assent. Bishop Juxon's advice to the king. Strafford's farewell to Laud. His execution and character. M. Guizot's remarks on his rule in Ireland. Undecided character of the king. Star chamber and high commission court abolished. The Scotch army having been paid return to their country. Civil liberty, and ecclesiastical tyranny, as regards the parliamentary proceedings. Queen Elizabeth and archbishop Parker on the puritans. Charles will not abolish episcopacy in England. He visits Scotland. Presbyterianism established there. Earl of Argyle made a marquis. Lesley made earl of Leven. The moderate presbyterians satisfied, but not the extreme party. Puritans in England are encouraged by these Scotch proceedings. Rebellion in Ireland. Sir Phelim O'Neill. Terrible massacre of 1641. Commons wish to deprive the

bishops of their seats in house of lords. The peers will not agree to it. The prelates illtreated, of which some complain, and are then committed to the Tower. The root and branch bill. The moderate party. Falkland, Hyde. The grand remonstrance. The term 'delinquents.' The king attempts to arrest the five members. Tumults follow. Parliament goes to the Guildhall, but returns to Westminster, and Charles leaves Whitehall. Cavaliers and roundheads. The king's army. Royal standard set up, 1642. Edgehill. Prince Rupert. Queen escapes to Holland. Lord Falkland killed. Estates of bishops and "delinquents" sequestered. "Assembly of divines" called by the commons at Westminster. The Scotch decline help unless presbyterianism is established in England. Some account of the new "directory." Burial of dead ordered to be without any service. The solemn league and covenant pressed by parliament. Scotch army crosses the border. The clergy persecuted as "scandalous ministers" and "delinquents." The independents are rising into power. Trial of archbishop Laud. Prynne employed against him. Laud's defence. Condemned to death. His last words. Executed January, 1645. Buried in church near the Tower, but afterwards in chapel of his college at Oxford. Sketch of Laud, and of his times. The independents. Battle of Marston Moor, 1644. The "new model." Fairfax and Cromwell. Battle of Naseby, June, 1645. Montrose. Use of the directory enforced. Use of the Common Prayer prohibited. Doctor Hacket and the parliamentary soldier. Episcopacy (root and branch) abolished, October, 1645. Presbyterians and independents disagree. Their remarks on schism, &c. The king goes to the Scotch camp in May, 1646; is delivered up by the Scotch to the parliament, on payment of money; and is taken to Holmby house, Northamptonshire. Parliament intends to check Cromwell, but his resolute will triumphs. The king is brought by his orders to Hampton court, afterwards to Carisbrooke castle. The episcopal lands sold, and great tyranny exercised towards the clergy. Spirited conduct of Oxford university. Its treatment by the rebels, and their treatment of Cambridge university. The Scots complain of the number of sectaries. The independents get the upper hand, and Cromwell expels the presbyterians from the house of commons. Royalist risings in Wales and the western counties. Cromwell subdues them, and the Scots under duke of Hamilton, at Preston. Fairfax at Colchester. Charles's negotiations with the commons stopped by the army; he is conveyed to Hurst castle. Cromwell overpowers the commons. "Pride's purge." The "rump" parliament. The trial of the king begun January, 1649, in Westminster hall. Bradshaw president. Lady Fairfax. Cromwell's speech. Sentence of death. The king's noble demeanour; takes leave of two of his children; is attended by bishop Juxon and his chaplain Herbert; is executed January 30th. Dean Hook's account of the execution. Is buried at Windsor. The tomb is opened in 1813. Some account of bishop Juxon. Character of the king page 336

CHAPTER XXIX.

Seventeenth Century (continued).

The presbyterians disapprove of the execution of the king. Remonstrance of their ministers in London. The "engagement," a kind of independent covenant. Act of parliament for "propagation" of the gospel in Wales, 1649, which was really a hindrance to the gospel. Tyranny to the clergy. Itinerant preachers. Vavasor Powell and others. The design of Hugh Peters carried out. The accusations made by him and Vavasor Powell against the Welsh clergy. Their falsehood. Hindrance to religion. Petition from South Wales to parliament, in 1652. Presented by Colonel Freeman. His remarks on the state of the Welsh parishes and clergy, caused by the act, and proofs given of the falsehoods against the clergy. Ireland. Marquis of Ormonde commands the forces there. Cromwell lands in Ireland, August, 1649. Siege of Drogheda, and massacre there. Wexford. Cromwell's apology. He conquers the country and leaves in spring of 1650. His successors in command finally

close the contest in 1652, and three of the provinces are confiscated. Act to abolish episcopacy, and the use of the Book of Common Prayer. Scotland. The kirk, a political faction. Cruelty of the covenanting leaders. The Scottish parliament wish to assist Charles I. before his execution. The presbyterian ministers oppose this. Religion made subservient to politics. After death of Charles the Scotch propose to raise the prince of Wales to the throne. Montrose returns to Scotland; his defeat and execution. Prince Charles comes in June, 1650. He promises to sign the covenant. Cromwell goes north. He defeats Leslie's army at Dunbar, but in 1651 the Scots army, with Charles at their head, marches into England. It is totally defeated at Worcester. Cromwell's "crowning mercy." Charles escapes to France. General Monk placed in charge of Scotland. The independents are now supreme. The remnant of the long parliament is expelled by Cromwell. An assembly succeeds, of 140 of his supporters, called "barebones parliament." Cromwell made protector in 1653. A new house of commons in 1654, which wishes to check Oliver Cromwell's power, but it is dissolved. Royalist risings at Salisbury, &c. The rule of the major generals. In September, 1656, a war with Spain causes Cromwell to want money, so he calls another parliament. One hundred of the members elected are refused admittance. Money voted. Some changes made. Oliver Cromwell permitted to appoint his successor. He gives toleration to all but Church of England and Romanists. He disagrees with parliament, dissolves it, and rules alone; his strength being in the army. Death of archbishop Usher. The "triers." Various acts against royalists. In 1656, the fifths are ordered to be paid to the expelled clergy, but they have great difficulties in obtaining them. Extracts from Evelyn's diary. Cromwell inclined to toleration, but fearful of the royalist influence of the Church. Rise and increase of sects at this time. Fifth monarchy men. Antinomians. Quakers. One of their number put in the pillory. Opinion of a presbyterian writer on the sects. Scotland. Cromwell does not allow a general assembly to meet. General Monk stops a meeting of ministers in Fife. Cromwell's power. His support of protestants in Europe. The state of religion in England. Members of the Church. Cromwell's last days. His death. Baxter's character of him. Comparison between Cromwell and Charles I., and sketch of the doings on both sides. Bishop Harold Browne on the puritans. Richard Cromwell becomes protector, but resigns in five months. The remnant of the long parliament called together by the army. The nation wishes for a settled government page 369

CHAPTER XXX.

Seventeenth Century (continued).

General Monk communicates with Charles II. Charles's declaration from Breda. Commissioners go to see the king at the Hague. He lands in England 26th May, 1660. His warm welcome. His declaration. Juxon made archbishop of Canterbury. The Savoy conference. Baxter's proposal. The conference breaks up. The bishops restored to their seats in the house of lords. The Common Prayer Book re-established in its present form. The clergy give up the right of voting their own supplies in convocation. On death of archbishop Juxon, he is succeeded by Sheldon. The act of uniformity, 1662. Remarks upon it. The restoration parliament. The corporation act, 1661. The conventicle act. The five-mile act. The duke of York a Romanist. The king suspected of being so. He wishes to dispense with the act of uniformity at his pleasure. Clarendon offends him by opposing this. The test act, 1672. Death of archbishop Sheldon. He is succeeded by Sancroft. Doctor Hacket and the burial service. Titus Oates's conspiracy causes severities against Romanists. They are excluded from parliament. The plague, 1665, and the great fire, 1666. Heroic conduct of Rev. W. Mompesson. Scotland. The resolutioners and the remonstrants. The king prohibits the renewal of the covenant. The rights of patrons restored. Douglas and Sharp. The latter goes to London. Episcopacy re-established in Scotland, 1661. Four Scottish prelates conse-

crated. Two parties amongst the presbyterians. Moderation of the episcopal Church. Attacks of the opposite party. The south-western counties oppose the right of the patrons, and 200 ministers resign their livings. The Scotch parliament passes an act against separation. The covenanters meet in the fields and houses. Insurrection, which is checked. Terms offered if they would sign a "bond of peace." An indulgence offered to the deprived ministers in 1669. Archbishop Sharp assassinated. Antiquity of the see of St. Andrews. Ancient chapel of the Culdees. The measures of government are more stringent, and the covenanters become more determined. They burn the acts of parliament. The sect of the Cameronians. Probable effects of greater leniency on the part of government. Ireland. Forfeiture of land in time of James I., and Cromwell's vigorous proceedings there, by which the Irish proprietors were removed to Connaught, and his troops settled as colonists, and the Romanist priests were removed from the country. On the restoration, one-third of the estates were returned to the Irish owners. The duke of Ormonde made lord lieutenant. Remarks by Macaulay. The Irish parliament and reformed Church restored. Act of uniformity passed. Tendency of mankind to run into extremes. Puritan moroseness succeeded by licentiousness. Death of Charles II. Eminent divines of the Church of England during this century. Sketch of Izaak Walton, John Evelyn, Mrs. Godolphin page 384

CHAPTER XXXI.

Seventeenth Century (continued).

James II., a bigoted Romanist. Mass performed in his palace and at Westminster. The pope cautions him. James repeals the test act. Revocation of edict of Nantes by Louis XIV. Compton, bishop of London. The clergy preach against the errors of popery. In 1687 James issued a declaration for liberty of conscience. Action of the dissenters. A tract written. Attacks by the king on the universities. He requires his declaration to be read by the clergy in every parish church. The archbishop of Canterbury and some of the bishops meet at Lambeth, and draw up a petition which they present to the king. His anger. The declaration is not read. The prelates summoned before the council. Their imprisonment, trial, and acquittal. Sir John Powell, his honourable conduct. Excitement in London and the country. The Cornish men and bishop Trelawny. Birth of the prince of Wales. The prince of Orange invited, and comes to England. James abdicates and leaves the country. The doctrine of "passive obedience," and difficult position of the clergy and loyalist laity. Scotland during reign of James II. He publishes his declaration for liberty of conscience there. The presbyterians and covenanters. Remarks on their intolerance. The episcopal Church unjustly charged with the cruel persecutions, which were really carried on by order of parliament. Oath of allegiance to William and Mary required. The non-jurors. Baxter and Bunyan page 405

CHAPTER XXXII.

Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.

William III. His religious principles. The terms high and low Church. The king a latitudinarian. Burnet made bishop of Salisbury; it is an unpopular appointment. Act for toleration and for comprehension. The former passed, the latter dropped. Oath of allegiance required from all. Convocation called. A scheme of concession to dissenters, and changes in the prayer book, which did not take place. The sees of non-juring bishops filled up in 1690. Sancroft succeeded by Tillotson as archbishop of Canterbury. Bishop Ken. Bill of rights. Names of whig and tory. William and Mary crowned.

Scotland. Persecution and 'rabbling' of episcopal clergy in the south-western counties. These outrages have been little alluded to by historians. William disapproved of them. The cathedral of Glasgow attacked. The convention of 1689. The covenanters come into Edinburgh during its sitting. Order to all ministers to pray for William and Mary. Very short notice to do so. Persecution of those who did not. Prelacy abolished by the convention. William indifferent to the form of church government. The abolishment of episcopacy made an article of contract by the Scotch whig leaders with William III. He wished for toleration for episcopacy, but the presbyterian ministers would not have it. The king desires them to be moderate. Episcopacy prevailed in the northern counties. Act to remove "scandalous ministers." Those who had been 'rabbled' were not restored. Tyrannical proceedings of the general assembly of 1690, and of the parliament of 1695. William did not wish this, but could not check it. The Cameronian covenanters fall gradually into oblivion. The English irritated at the conduct of the presbyterians in Scotland. Episcopalians persecuted also in New England. Ireland. Ill-feeling between the natives and the colonists. James II. removes Ormonde. Appoints Clarendon lord lieutenant, and Tyrconnell general of the forces, but the latter has all the power. Clarendon recalled in 1687. Tyrconnell gets together an army: all papists. Siege of Londonderry. Its heroic defence. James II. comes to Ireland. William III. goes there, 1690. Battle of the Boyne. James defeated. Retires to France, and dies there in 1701. William's coldness to the English clergy. Dean Hook's remarks on the term 'protestant.' Patrick, bishop of Ely. Latitudinarian bishops. Tenison made archbishop of Canterbury: the queen wished for Stillingfleet. Convocation meets towards the end of this reign, but disputes arise between the two houses. Wales attached to the exiled family. English bishops and clergy appointed there. Collections at church doors. Chelsea hospital and Greenwich hospital founded. Oath of abjuration. Mary died in 1694. William dies, 1702. Unpopular as a king, but his toleration was a blessing. Anne succeeds. The electress Sophia prayed for in the liturgy, as next heir to throne. Differing views of the bishops and the parochial clergy. See of St. David's. Dr. Bull. St. Asaph. Dr. Beveridge. His work on the catechism. Union of Scotland. Convocation opposes it, but is prorogued, and not again summoned till 1710. Dr. Hoadly. Dr. Sacheverell. His sermons. His trial, sentence, and popularity. Queen Anne restores the tenths and first-fruits to the Church. Account of "queen Anne's bounty." Festival and corporation of sons of the clergy. Private societies for reformation of manners, in reign of James II. S.P.C.K. S.P.G. Scotland. Petition of episcopalians to queen Anne. Her answer. Oath of abjuration. Proposal in Scotch parliament to give toleration. Opposed by the presbyterians. Book of Common Prayer coming into use. The union disliked by the presbyterians. To appease them the episcopal chapels are ordered to be closed for a time. Mr. Greenshields, an episcopalian clergyman in 1709, prohibited by the Edinburgh presbytery, and imprisoned. After the union an act of toleration is passed by the united parliament. Death of queen Anne in 1714. Changed state of affairs. More stringent laws are put in force against the non-jurors. The Jacobite rising in 1715 causes still more severe measures to be adopted page 417

CHAPTER XXXIII.

Eighteenth Century.

Accession of George I. Doctor Hoadly made bishop of Bangor. His writings. They are censured in the lower house of convocation. Convocation is prorogued in 1717. The "Bangorian controversy" still carried on. Increase of infidelity and immorality. George II. succeeds to the throne, 1727, but brings no improvement. Wales. Its condition after the time of the commonwealth. The Rev. T. Gouge establishes schools for the poor.; English bishops and clergy appointed in Wales. Reasons for so doing. Religious

reform begun by Rev. Griffith Jones. His system of catechizing. Ignorance of the people, and generally irreligious state of the country. He begins his circulating charity schools, 1730. Rules for the masters. Extracts from Mr. Jones's letter to a brother clergyman, 1744. He is assisted in the support of his schools by Mrs. Bevan. The first printing-press in Wales, 1718. Scarcity of Welsh Bibles. S.P.C.K. prints two large editions. Mr. Jones's explanation of the baptismal portion of the church catechism and creed, published by S.P.C.K. His powers of preaching. He dies, 1761. Mrs. Bevan continues his schools for twenty years. She dies, and leaves money for them; the will is disputed by her heir at law, put in chancery, and at last decided in favour of the schools. The money is still spent on education, but now on church schools which need assistance. Debt of gratitude due to Mr. Jones and Mrs. Bevan. Scotland. The episcopal Church makes progress there after the Jacobite rising of 1715. Her bishops meet in synod, and make canons in 1743. In 1745, the rising for Charles Edward changes this. Passionate attachment of the Scotch for the Stuart line. The victory of Culloden. Vengeance taken on the episcopal communion. Chapels destroyed. Clergy compelled to flee, &c. Severe penal statute of 1746, and again of 1748, affecting both laity and clergy. The episcopal clergy suffer severely, and many leave Scotland. In England, a revival of religious life is begun by John and Charles Wesley, about 1738. Their society at Oxford, called the sacramentarian club. George Whitfield joins it. The Church's system followed out by its members. The two Wesleys go to America, 1735. Return, 1738. Wesley's theological inquiries and studies. The Oxford church revival anticipated by the Wesleys. Weekly communion, &c. The Wesleys begin preaching in the open air, which Whitfield had already done. Wesley wished to work with the Church. His plan of private societies. His devotion to the work. A few of the clergy join them. They wish to obtain episcopal sanction. The archbishop of Canterbury and bishop of London are at a loss how to give it. The foundry at Moorfields taken in 1740, for preaching, by Wesley. His schoolmaster preaches there. Wesley at first displeased, but afterwards organizes lay preaching. It could not be carried out under the church's control. A new preaching order formed by Wesley, and Methodism made into a regular system between 1739 and 1744. Wesley adheres to the doctrine of the Anglican Church. He anticipates the views of our own day. His lay preachers were meant to arouse the people and to help the clergy. Some personal risk at first to the Wesleys. In June, 1744, the first annual conference is held by the Wesleys, which assumed the character of a modern retreat. They divide England into circuits. Preaching houses established. The United Society. Wesley attends church, and requires his followers to do so. No meetings held in church hours. His assistance might have been valuable to the Church. Difficult position of the prelates. The state had encroached on the liberty of the Church. Wesley's first visit to Ireland, 1747. His sermon on the priestly office. At the conference of 1755, the question of separation is decided in the negative. The brothers consider the lay preachers too ambitious. Charles Wesley, the stricter churchman of the two. Accession of George III., 1760. He gains the affections of his people. Improved state of the court. The archbishop of Canterbury wished to send bishops to America, but it was opposed. Socinianism amongst the clergy. Their petition to parliament in 1771. It is rejected. Some of them join the Socinians. In 1778, the laws against Romanists are less severe, and dissenting ministers are not required to sign the 39 articles. Methodism advances. There had been a controversy between Wesley and Whitfield, but they are eventually reconciled. Wesley fears his system cannot be united with that of the Church. His letter to Sir J. Trelawny. He departs from church principles by ordaining ministers for America, and sends superintendents there, one of whom assumes the title of bishop. Wesley is persuaded to ordain some ministers for Scotland. No excuse for this proceeding. Letter from the chapel trustees in 1793 as to Wesley's view of his ordinations, but separation was the result. Resemblance in some parts of Wesley's revival to the Oxford church revival. Wesley's preaching. His last declaration. He dies, 1791. The separation takes

place. Charles Wesley. His disapproval of his brother's ordinations. His merits as a poet. Rev. J. Fletcher, of Madeley. George Whitfield. His extraordinary powers of preaching. He and the Wesleys dissimilar, but both were great evangelists. Selina, countess of Huntingdon; her chapels and college. She dies, 1791. Wales. Rev. Daniel Rowlands. The mode of spending Sunday in Wales. He preaches and addresses the people on the subject. His success. He takes to open air preaching, and itinerates from place to place in Wales. Preaches at Llanddewi-brefi. His actions disapproved by the heads of the Church, and his curacies taken from him. A chapel built for him at Llangeitho. "Jumpers." Holy communion attended by large numbers from all parts. He did not wish to separate from the Church. Rev. T. Charles, of Bala. His first curacies. He was then perhaps deficient in judgment. Teaches the young people in his house at Bala. This was the origin of Sunday schools in Wales. In 1789, they are carried out on a regular system. Adults attend them. Quickness of the Welsh children. The Bible then their chief book. Mr. Charles joins the Methodists in 1784, but they were still in connection with the established Church. Mr. Charles's opinions as to separation. Scarcity of Welsh Bibles. S.P.C.K. publishes 5000. Mr. Charles takes an active part in the establishment of the Bible Society; so does Mr. Jones, of Creaton page 441

CHAPTER XXXIV.

Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries.

The peace between England and the United States in 1783 leads to the episcopate in the states. Dr. Seabury comes to England for consecration, but is consecrated by the Scotch prelates. Doctor Porteus, bishop of Chester. Mr. Wilberforce. Hannah More. Mr. Wilberforce's book, its large sale. Rise of the evangelical party. The high church party of that day. Charles Simeon. Bible Society. Church Missionary Society. Bishop Crowther. Advantages and duty of mission work. The National Society. Meaning of the term 'charity schools.' Wales. The methodist lay preachers desire ordination. Mr. Charles consents to this in 1810, and the separation from the Church takes place. Eight of them set apart for the office of ministers. This displeases those clergy who had worked with them. Their secession is a loss to the Church. The revival in the Church is slow. Sketch of Welsh churches, clergy, and laity. Mr. Jones, of Llangan, and Mr. Griffiths, of Nevern. The dissenting Sunday schools. The Bible never neglected in day and Sunday schools in those days. Dissenters not then hostile to the Church. The baptists and Christmas Evans. Bishop Burgess of St. David's. He founds St. David's college, aided by Mr. Harford. Improving state of the clergy and laity. The Welsh education fund is formed, and is assisted by the National Society. Training college in 1847 at Carmarthen. Great disadvantage to the Church in the large amount of lay tithes. The penal laws still existed in Scotland. Charles Edward Stuart dies, 1788, and George III. is publicly prayed for in all the episcopal chapels. In 1792 the penal statutes of 1746 and 1748 are repealed, but one disability still remained. Canons drawn up in 1817. The English communion office. List of Scotch prelates. In 1864 the last disability is removed. Clergy of English and Irish orders; no further reason for this irregularity. Increase in the number of clergy and congregations, and of the influence of the episcopal Church. Ireland; little to relate of the Church there. Rebellion of 1798. The union in 1801. Increasing influence of the Romanist clergy. The "catholic association." It is suppressed by act of parliament in 1825. Roman catholic emancipation in 1829. Ten bishops' sees suppressed in 1833. The Irish Church disestablished in 1869, and is now exerting herself to meet her altered position. Mr. Raikes, of Gloucester, and Sunday schools. Doctor Bell. Joseph Lancaster. The British and Foreign School Society. Conference at Haddleigh in 1833. *Tracts for the Times*. Good resulting from the Oxford movement. Canon Miller's speech at Islington. External events connected with the Church. Repeal of the test and corporation acts, 1828. Roman

catholic emancipation, 1829. Education bill of 1840 defeated by dissenters. The Church increases its exertions in education. The government assists with grants in 1846; this is also opposed by the same party, but they afterwards accept the grants. The ecclesiastical commission, 1836. Pius IX. appoints an archbishop and bishops in England in 1850. In 1868 compulsory church rates abolished. Education act in 1870. Statistics shewing the amounts given by churchmen for schools. The religious divisions prevent instruction in the creed, &c., in board schools. Eagerness of the leaders of the Welsh dissenters for board schools, and their objections to religious instruction in them. Statistics of the amounts given by churchmen for churches and parsonage houses. Revival of convocation. Revival of suffragan bishops. The colonial Church. Increase of the episcopate. Advantages of this step. In 1840 the colonial bishopric fund is begun. Meeting at Lambeth. Three sees endowed by Baroness Burdett-Coutts. St. Augustine's college, Canterbury, 1848. Third jubilee of the S.P.G. in 1850. Number of the colonial and missionary bishoprics in 1876. New Zealand and bishop Selwyn. Newfoundland and bishop Feild. Many other Christian heroes in the colonial Church. English ladies are assisting in the work. Missionary bishops. Mackenzie. Patteson. The American episcopal Church. Its rise and rapid increase. Its missionary spirit. Pan-Anglican conferences. Conclusion *page 462*



ANGLICAN CHURCH HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

THE FIRST TO THE FOURTH CENTURY.

It was in the year 55 B.C. that the Romans first set foot on British ground, led by Julius Cæsar, who, having previously conquered Gaul, crossed the British channel and landed on the coast of Kent. He soon retired, but repeated his invasion in the following year, when, having dealt a more positive blow, he abandoned the island entirely. In his account of our forefathers, Cæsar says that the island was well populated, with houses built after the manner of the Gauls; that the inhabitants of Kent were the most civilized; those further in the interior never sowed their land, but lived on flesh and milk, and were clad in skins; cattle abounded; the people were very expert in the use of war chariots, and were armed with darts; they painted their bodies blue, used brass money, and were divided into tribes.

The religion of the Britons, as also that of the Gauls, was Druidism. Their priests, the Druids, were held in great reverence by the people, and determined most disputes whether public or private; they fixed rewards and punishments, and were the supreme judges in criminal cases; those who refused to obey their commands were not admitted to the sacrifices, being accounted wicked and impious; shunned by their fellows, they were outlawed and excluded from all public offices. The Druids were all under one chief, upon whose death one of the priests succeeded to the dignity, if he was considered to excel the rest; but when there were several candidates of equal merit the choice was determined by the majority. Sometimes recourse was had to arms before the election was decided. The Druids were exempt from war and taxes, which encouraged many to follow that profession; they thought it unlawful to commit their statutes to writing, but learnt much by heart. Their religion was extremely cruel; under certain circumstances

they offered human sacrifices, and they sometimes prepared an immense image of wicker work, which was filled with victims and then set on fire. They believed that the soul never perished, but passed after death from one body to another, and they imagined that this disarmed death of its terrors and exalted the courage of men.¹

The Romans allowed nearly a century to elapse after Cæsar's invasion before any further attempt was made on the British territory, for it was not till A.D. 43 that the emperor Claudius crossed the channel, and under his generals the southern part of the island became a Roman province, with frequent intercourse between the two countries. The natives were taught by their conquerors to clothe themselves, to build better houses, to make roads and bridges, and were thus gradually led to adopt the habits and culture of their more civilized masters. The remains of Roman roads, which connected their different stations, are still to be seen in various parts of the kingdom, and in the work which bears the name of Richard of Cirencester it is stated that one of the great roads, called the Via Julia, which passed through South Wales, was carried on from Muridunum (Carmarthen) to a point on the western coast, from whence there was a short passage to Ireland, by which it would appear that there was a Roman station in the neighbourhood of St. David's.

Some time elapsed before the Britons became peaceful subjects of the Cæsars, but they were at last unable to withstand the discipline of the Roman legions. Two names are recorded as of those who gave most trouble to their conquerors—Boadicea, queen of the Iceni, and Caractacus, chieftain or prince of the western or south western portion of the island. In one of their revolts this chief was taken prisoner, and sent with his family to Rome; his captivity brings us to the important period of the introduction of Christianity into Britain.

We have some authority for believing that this took place during the first century or soon afterwards. Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, in Gaul, himself a disciple of Polycarp, who was the disciple of our Saviour's beloved apostle, St. John, speaks of churches which were established by the apostles and their disciples amongst the Celtic nations. Eusebius and Theodoret, very ancient church historians, hold the same opinion. The former, after naming different countries visited by the apostles, says that some passed over the ocean to those which are called the British Isles. Theodoret names the Britons amongst the nations converted by the apostles.²

We also hear of two British Christian ladies: one was Pompina Græcina, whose life was in peril through her belief in this foreign superstition, and whose husband was a Roman lieutenant in Britain in the reign of the emperor Claudius. The other, named Claudia Rufina, was married to a noble Roman senator named

¹ See Duncan's *Cæsar's Commentaries of his Wars in Gaul*, books iv., v., and vi.

² Stillingfleet's *Antiquities of the British Churches*, ch. i., p. 37, ed. 1685.

Pudens, and they are supposed to be the persons mentioned by St. Paul in his second Epistle to Timothy, iv. 21. The Roman poet Martial celebrates the wit and beauty of Claudia in the following stanzas :—

BEFORE HER MARRIAGE WITH PUDENS.

From painted Britons how was Claudia born ?
The fair barbarian ! How do arts adorn !
When Roman charms a Grecian soul commend,
Athens and Rome may for the dame contend.

AFTER HER MARRIAGE.

Oh, Rufus ! Pudens, whom I own my friend,
Has ta'en the foreign Claudia for his wife,
Propitious Hymen light the torch, and send
Long years of bliss to their united life.

Caractacus and other British prisoners were in Rome when St. Paul was there, and it has been thought probable that some of them at that time embraced Christianity and carried its blessed truths to their countrymen when they returned to Britain.¹

The following are some of the reasons given by those writers who supposed that St. Paul visited these islands. Clemens Romanus, who was bishop of Rome, and lived during the latter days of the apostles, says, "St. Paul preached righteousness through the world, and in doing so went to the utmost parts of the west." Theodoret states that St. Paul brought salvation to the islands that lie in the ocean. St. Jerome, who lived in the fourth century, states that St. Paul, after his imprisonment in Rome, preached the gospel in the western parts. It has been suggested that St. Paul while at Rome might have received encouragement from Pompina Græcina to come hither, and that if Claudia was a disciple of St. Paul (2 Tim. iv. 21), she might also have incited that apostle to plant Christianity in her country.² On the other hand it is stated by more recent writers that the visit of any apostle to our shores is "destitute of any real ground to rest upon." The connection of Pudens and Claudia named by St. Paul with the Pudens and Claudia named by Martial has also been contradicted, though it is admitted that "it is yet possible, that the two pairs may be one and the same."³ During such early times in Britain the absence of positive testimony precludes any dogmatic assertion respecting the date of the introduction of Christianity. The testimony of Tertullian and Origen would lead to the belief that it had taken root in this country in the second century.⁴ Those who are doubtful of, or who disbelieve, so early an origin admit that in the time of Constantius Chlorus the existence of a British Church is indisputable, but assert that there was no Church, though there

¹ Stillingfleet, ch. i., pp. 37, 38, 43, 44.

² Stillingfleet, ch. i., p. 45.

³ *Remains* of late Rev. W. Haddan, edited by bishop Forbes, pp. 226, 229.

⁴ Stillingfleet, ch. ii., p. 50.

might be some Christian individuals, in this island before A.D. 200.¹ But did not these individuals constitute a Church though it might be small?

The Romans do not appear to have disturbed the Britons in the exercise of Christianity before the time of the Diocletian persecution, which reached this country about A.D. 301 or 303. This was the tenth and last persecution throughout the Roman empire, though it was the first that reached these shores; it lasted ten years, but did not exist above two years in our island. It took its name from the emperor Diocletian, who issued various edicts against the Christians. The first edict directed that their churches were to be pulled down, their writings burned, and all their civil rights and privileges to be taken from them; also that they were to be incapable of promotion or honour, but their lives were to be spared, as Diocletian was averse to slaughter and bloodshed.

The second edict, which ordered all the Christian bishops and pastors to be thrown into prison, was issued in consequence of a great fire which broke out in the emperor's palace, and which calamity was attributed to the Christians. A third edict followed, by which all sorts of punishments and torments were invented to make these captives renounce their religion, and sacrifice to the heathen gods; as it was hoped if the bishops and pastors did so, their flocks would soon follow their example. A fourth edict was published, by which the magistrates were desired to spare neither rank nor sex amongst the Christians, but to insist on all sacrificing to the heathen gods, and to use every kind of torture to force them to do so.² These edicts were engraven in tablets of brass, and set up on pillars in every city.³ Baronius states that the following inscription "may be read on a magnificent column at Clunia in Spain" (near Aranda, on the Douro):—"In memory of the augmentation of the Roman empire both in the east and west, and of the utter extinction of the name of Christians, who were overturning the republic." Another inscription in the same place has this meaning—"In memory — of the universal extinction of the religion of Christ."⁴ So certain did Diocletian and his colleagues feel that they should crush for ever the Christian religion! But our Saviour has built his Church on a rock that no earthly power can destroy.

This persecution was bloodier and more lasting than any other had been. The first of Britain's martyrs, whose name has been handed down to us, is Alban, a native of Verulanum, in the county of Hertford, then a Roman station, where the town of St. Alban's now stands, so called in honour of this our first martyr. Alban suffered death for the cause of Christ. At the

¹ Haddan's *Remains*, p. 224, on "the Churches of the British Confession."

² Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History*, translated by Archibald Maclaine, D.D., vol. i., p. 232—234.

³ Foxe's *Acts and Monuments of the Church*, 10th Persecution, folio, vol. i., p. 91.

⁴ Stillingfleet, ch. ii., p. 78.

commencement of the persecution he hid one of the clergy in his house, and was so struck by his religious piety, that he received instruction from him, and became himself a Christian. The hiding place of the pastor was at length discovered, but Alban determined to save him if he could. Therefore, when the soldiers came and demanded him, Alban dressed himself in his clothes, and was taken before the magistrates. They soon found out he was not the person whom they sought, and angrily ordered him to sacrifice to their gods. This he boldly refused to do, saying that he was a believer in the one true God, and that their gods were no better than devils. Upon hearing this they scourged him, and as he would not deny his Saviour, he was taken to a hill overlooking the town, where he was put to death.¹ A few years afterwards a British church was erected over the grave of this martyr, and in later times, Offa, one of our Anglo-Saxon kings, founded the fine old abbey of St. Alban's to his memory, about A.D. 793.

The venerable historian Bede records the names of two other British martyrs, said by some to have been inhabitants of the city of Caerleon upon Usk, and he states that many more of both sexes yielded up their lives at this time.² Of these, the earliest martyrs of our Church, we may say with the poet—

“Writ in heaven,
Their names unread in human story,
Shine like the morning stars in glory;
In robes of whiteness, freely given,
Palms in their hands, the victor band,
Before the Lamb, their Saviour, stand.”

LORD LINDSEY.

Soon after the emperor Diocletian retired from the throne, and was succeeded by Constantius Chlorus, who had previously been governor of part of the western empire, and had spent much of his time in Britain. He was a friend to the Christians, and his mild and humane temper made him averse to cruelty. Like Agrippa, Acts xxvi. 28, he had been “almost persuaded to be a Christian;” for we are told by Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea, a writer of that day, that Constantius worshipped but one God, the maker of all things, that he had Christians in his palace, and amongst them pastors of the Church, who openly prayed for him.³ It was probably owing to his friendship and influence that the persecution which raged so long in other parts of the empire was kept from this island till towards its close.

Bede says that when the persecution ceased, those Christians who had hidden themselves in woods and caves came forth and rebuilt their churches, and that their peace was not disturbed until the Arian heresy. Constantius, who died A.D. 306, was buried at

¹ Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, Giles's translation, b. i., ch. vii.

² Bede, book i., ch. vii.

³ Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Youngman's edition, ch. xvi., p. 228. Milner's *Church History*, in one vol., p. 209.

Eboracum, now York, and was succeeded by his son Constantine, called the Great.

Ireland was anciently called Scotia and Hibernia,¹ also Erin or Ierne, from whence the name of Ireland; but Scotia was the name by which it was distinguished at this time and during the succeeding centuries; the inhabitants being known as Scots. Some writers state that the country was visited by Christian missionaries within one hundred years of the crucifixion of our Saviour. But at whatever time Christianity was introduced it flourished and bore fruit, and at a later date we shall find missionaries from Scotia spreading the truths of the gospel to other lands.

Much uncertainty exists as to the time when Christianity was brought into Caledonia or Albania, which were the ancient names of Scotland. It has been asserted that Donald, one of the kings of that country, sent to Victor, bishop of Rome, about A.D. 203, to ask him to send persons to instruct his people in the Christian religion,² but this is not believed. No native historian existed then, as our Gildas and our Bede, to give an account of those early days.

The Romans did not advance beyond the southern portion of Caledonia, as the mountainous character of the country, the severe climate, and the savage nature of the Picts, who inhabited the northern part, were formidable barriers to their arms, and obstacles to the civilization that attended them.³ They raised walls to keep back these northern barbarians. One of these was built by Hadrian, afterwards emperor of Rome: it extended from the Tyne to the Esk, about 80 miles in length. Another was erected by Antoninus Pius, and ran across the country from the Forth to the Clyde.⁴

¹ See *History and Antiquities of Ireland*, by Sir James Ware, knight.
Bede, p. 5, and note in the same.

² Boethius—quoted by Stillingfleet, ch. ii., p. 52.

³ Russell's *History of the Church in Scotland*, vol. i., p. 2.

⁴ Camden's *Britannia*, bishop Gibson's edition. folio, vol. ii., pp. 1044, 1220.
Bede, book i., ch. xii.

CHAPTER II.

CENTURY IV.

CONSTANTINE THE GREAT TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE ROMANS FROM BRITAIN.

CONSTANTINE the Great, who had from early life been favourably disposed to Christianity, adopted the Christian faith a few years after he succeeded to the Roman empire. This caused a great change, and as it followed so closely upon the ten years' persecution, the contrast was more remarkable. Churches were now built, idol temples destroyed, and the ministers of Christ were honoured; the emperor not only encouraged the meeting of bishops in councils or synods, but attended them himself; and he did all in his power to enrich the Church of God. Constantine directed the sacred observance of the Lord's day, to which he added Friday, as being the day of our Lord's crucifixion; he had prayers and the reading of the Scriptures at his court, and caused the soldiers of his army to be taught to pray by a short form composed for them. He furnished Eusebius with copies of the Scriptures for the use of the churches. The festivals celebrated in most of the Christian churches in this reign were five in number. They commemorated our Saviour's birth, his sufferings and death, his resurrection, his ascension, and the descent of the Holy Spirit. Of these none were kept with so much solemnity as the fourteen days appointed to commemorate the death and resurrection of our Lord. In some places the Holy Communion was administered two or three times a week; in others on every Lord's day.¹

The emperor made no essential alterations in the form of government in the Church, only assuming to himself the management of its outward state in such a manner as should be most conducive to the public good. This comprehended all contests and debates between the bishops and clergy concerning their possessions, reputation, rights and privileges, offences against the laws, and things of a like nature. Matters purely religious were left to the bishops and councils, such as doctrinal points and forms of divine worship. Edicts were published by which everything of which the Church had been deprived was restored to it, and the emperor recommended the governors of the provinces to promote the gospel teaching, though he did not oblige them or others to profess it. Constantine and his successors called councils and presided in them.² Thus we see that the Church was recognized and protected by the state as soon as the head of the state became a Christian.

The bishops of Antioch, of Alexandria, and Rome had a sort of

¹ Milner's *Church History*, pp. 209, 210. Mosheim, vol. i., p. 292—294.

² Mosheim, vol. i., p. 255—258.

pre-eminence over their brethren, and to these the bishop of Constantinople was added after Constantine had removed the seat of government from Rome to that city. This would be from the same reason that our bishops of London, Durham, and Winchester take precedence of their brethren in this country; not to exercise control, but as a tribute of respect to the sees represented by them. The emperor enriched and honoured Constantinople, and neither he nor his successors disapproved of its bishops assuming an equal degree of dignity with that of Rome; for they considered their own dignity to be in a measure connected with that of their imperial city.

The bishop of Rome surpassed all his brethren in the magnificence of the Church over which he presided, but notwithstanding the splendour which surrounded this great see, no bishop acknowledged that he derived his authority from it.¹ The bishops of Rome received the honour due to those of the first city in the world, and no more.

The first council of the Church was that mentioned in Holy Writ as being held by the apostles, on the subject of circumcision (see Acts xv. 6); but the first council called by a Christian sovereign was held at Arles, in the south of France, A.D. 314, in consequence of some disputes which had arisen in the Church of Carthage, in Africa, and it was summoned by the emperor because he considered the disputes might be healed through the discussion of the subject by the bishops of the western provinces. From this time forth councils and synods were frequently called together by the civil power.

The people continued to choose their bishops, who were consecrated to their holy office by other bishops. They governed the Church, and managed its affairs in the city or see over which they presided in council with their presbyters or priests; neither was the voice of the laity disregarded. These bishops, when assembled in their provincial councils or synods, deliberated concerning those matters that related to the interests of their churches, also concerning religious controversies, the forms and rites of divine service, and other things of like moment. To these lesser councils, which were composed of ecclesiastical deputies from one or more provinces, were afterwards added œcumenical (or general) councils, which consisted of deputies from all the churches of the Christian world, and which represented the Church catholic or universal. These were established by the authority of the emperor Constantine.²

At the provincial council of Arles before mentioned, three British bishops were present.³ They were Eborius, bishop of York; Restitutus, bishop of London; and Adelfius, bishop of Caerleon, now in the diocese of Llandaff. The Romans had divided Britain into provinces, namely, Maxima Cæsariensis, Britannia

¹ Mosheim, vol. i., pp. 257, 261.

² Mosheim, vol. i., p. 256.

³ Stillingfleet, ch. ii., p. 74.

Prima, and Britannia Secunda, of which London, York, and Caerleon were the chief cities. The last named was called by the Romans Isca and Legio Secunda, and by the Britons Caerlleon-ar-Wysg, which signifies 'the city of the legion on the river Usk,' from its being the colony of the second legion of Augustus, in the province of Britannia Secunda.¹ It is therefore thought that those bishops represented each of these provinces at Arles. A recent writer observed with regard to the presence of British bishops, that the fact must not be brought forward as proof of the existence of a strong Christian Church in Britain at this early date; he considered that the British Christians, until towards the departure of the Romans, A.D. 410, were to be found only in Roman settlements, and that there are scanty traces of Celtic Christians or of a Celtic Church beyond the Roman limits.² Such may have been the case; it is however certain that the Church had obtained sufficient footing in Britain to enable it to withstand the subsequent inroads of heathen nations, and eventually to give to those heathens the blessing of the gospel.

One of the canons instituted at the council of Arles was that no bishop should domineer over another, or invade another's province; that no bishop should be consecrated by another alone, but that there should be at least three to consecrate. The bishop of Rome was, from some cause, unable to be present, and as a proof that there was then no acknowledgment of his supreme authority, they told him they had been assembled at the emperor's command, and they wished he had been present, for they should have been glad of the company of their brother of Rome.³ The titles 'holy father' and 'vicar of Christ' were neither claimed by nor accorded to the Roman bishops of those days.

The Arian heresy had now appeared in the east, so called from Arius, a native of Alexandria, who succeeded in drawing many over to his opinions. The rapid spread of this heresy, which denied the divinity of our Saviour, caused much disquiet and controversy, but the British Church was not infected by it. The first œcumenical council was held on this account; it was called by Constantine, and was a gathering of the representatives of the whole Christian Church, to consider what measures should be adopted to check the progress of this great error. It was held at Nice or Nicea, in Bithynia, A.D. 325, and the emperor being present, exhorted both parties to bear and forbear, with a view to peace and union.⁴ The Nicene Creed, in the Communion service, in our Book of Common Prayer, was composed at this council, though the latter clauses were added at a later date. It began to be used in the Communion service A.D. 339.⁵ The divinity of our Saviour is plainly stated in this creed. Many other subjects were

¹ Camden, vol. ii., p. 717.

² Haddan's *Remains*, p. 230.

³ Stillingfleet, ch. ii., pp. 76, 84, 85.

⁴ Milner, pp. 214, 215.

⁵ See Bishop Mant on the Common Prayer.

brought before the council for the better ordering of the Church, and its canons or ecclesiastical laws are often referred to in the present day. The council decreed, as that at Arles had done, that each bishop should be consecrated to his office by three others,¹ in order, as time wore on, that no link in the apostolic chain should be broken. Three hundred and eighteen bishops, besides other clergy, were present at this famous council.

The list of bishops who attended it is imperfect and confused, and the British bishops are not named; but most authors are of opinion that they were present, as it is not probable they would have been omitted considering Constantine's interest in these isles; and we may regard it with more certainty as we know that British bishops were at the councils of Arles A.D. 314, of Sardica A.D. 347, and of Ariminium, in Italy, A.D. 359.²

Whilst Arianism was distracting the eastern, and part of the western Church, we have the testimony of writers of this century to the purity and independence of the British churches. They were congratulated on their freedom from heresy by Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, in Gaul.³ The intimate connection of the British churches with that of Gaul is constantly exhibited, and during this and part of the succeeding century the influence of Hilary of Poitiers, Martin of Tours, and Germain of Auxerre, was exercised very beneficially. The old British churches at Canterbury and at Whitherne were dedicated to St. Martin, and of the bishop of Auxerre's assistance and counsel we shall soon hear.⁴

The Athanasian Creed was composed as a further safeguard against the errors of Arius, and is supposed to have been framed from the writings of the great and good bishop Athanasius, who stood up so nobly for the truth against his fellow townsman Arius,⁵ and who afterwards became patriarch of Alexandria. During this century baptismal fonts were erected in the porch of each church for the convenience of administering that sacrament.

We cannot close this sketch of the ecclesiastical events of the fourth century without naming St. Jerome and St. Ambrose; the former was one of the early monks, the latter was bishop of Milan. The services rendered to the Christian cause by Jerome will hand down his name to the latest ages, and amongst the many Latin versions of the Scriptures his was distinguished by its undoubted superiority. His translation of the New Testament was called *Versio Gallicana*, because it was received at once by the Gallican Church. The bishop of Milan took a strong part against Arianism. He taught his people to sing hymns and psalms, at the end of which was the solemn doxology in honour of the Trinity, such as "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost." This method of responsive singing had been generally practised in

¹ Stillingfleet, ch. ii., p. 35.

² Stillingfleet, ch. iii., pp. 90, 91.

³ Barham's edition of Collier's *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. i., p. 85.

⁴ Haddan's *Remains*, p. 234.

⁵ Bishop Mant on the Common Prayer.

the east, and was introduced by Ambrose into the Church of Milan, whence it was soon copied by all the western churches. St. Ambrose died A.D. 397; his hymns were received in Gaul, and in the Gallican churches, and the "Gloria Patri" was said at the end of each psalm.¹

Other matters now demand our attention, which, though not exactly belonging to the history of the Church, are connected with it. Constantine the Great removed the seat of empire from Rome to Byzantium, called afterwards Constantinople. The division of the empire between his three sons hastened its fall. It had for some time been in a tottering condition, though its failing powers were propped up by the vigorous reign of Constantine, and that of Theodosius; but when their guidance was lost, its real weakness became evident. The civil wars which arose between the sons of Constantine were the cause of the Franks settling in part of Gaul. These pagans, who came from Germany, were employed by one brother to disturb the dominions of the other.

During the reign of Constans the son of Constantine, the Picts, the Saxons, and other tribes, made destructive inroads into Britain, its superior riches and fruitfulness being their attraction. Every messenger who could cross the British channel carried melancholy tidings to Rome. About A.D. 370, Valentinian, emperor of the west, sent his general Theodosius to stop the ravages of those barbarians in Britain. He defeated several parties of them, and gave back much of the spoil to the rightful owners. The citizens of London, who had despaired of their safety, opened its gates to their deliverer. Theodosius restored the cities and the fortifications, and confined the inhabitants of Caledonia to the northern corner of the island. His son, who became emperor, was called Theodosius the Great. In him the Christian Church had as valuable a friend as it had had in Constantine, for he was as truly good as he was great, and during his reign the grandeur of the empire revived. He was succeeded in the empire of the east by his eldest son, and in that of the west by his youngest son, Honorius; for this great empire had become divided into two sovereignties in the beginning of the fifth century.²

The tranquillity in Britain was of short duration. Rome was besieged by the Goths under Alaric, and the Roman forces were gradually withdrawn from the island. The emperor Honorius, who had chosen Ravenna for his place of residence, held the reins of government with an unsteady hand, and sent letters desiring the Britons to protect themselves: he was now powerless to assist them. This was about the year 410; but some historians give a later date for the final departure of the Romans from Britain.

The Goths, who were a warlike people, had long been making inroads on the territories of the empire, but had been received as subjects. They were mostly Christians, and had been famed for

¹ Mosheim, vol. i., pp. 68, 271, 294. Milner, p. 263. Collier, vol. i., p. 113.

² Gibbon, ch. xxv., p. 404, and ch. xxvii., p. 461.

their hospitality and kindness to strangers even before they were converted to Christianity. About this time they threw off the Roman yoke, and besieged the city of Rome, led by their famous king, Alaric. They were induced to depart by the payment of sums of money by the emperor Honorius, but renewed their attacks, and at length entered the imperial city. Alaric desired his followers to spare the churches, but his army was chiefly composed of pagan tribes, far more barbarous than his Goths; and they committed great cruelties, destroying many of the works of art, besides carrying off immense spoil. Alaric did not finally take Rome till the third siege, A.D. 410.¹

In Britain, the Roman occupation had not Romanized the country, as it had done in Gaul and Spain,² yet the inhabitants had been largely benefited by it. Fifty years before Christ, the Romans had found the inhabitants pagans; they left them with a Christian Church. It was not the practice of this great people to drive out the natives of the conquered countries, but rather to civilize them and improve their condition; and the Britons had made considerable advances in civilization during the stay of the Romans, who had built market-places and public baths in their towns. Their flocks and herds were numerous, their crops were plentiful, and there were ninety-two considerable towns in different parts of the provinces.³ A Welsh writer of the 12th century mentions the ruins of the ancient city of Caerleon. He speaks of its palaces, of the ruins of ancient temples, and the theatres, encompassed with walls which were still partly standing. He names also a high tower and remarkable hot baths.⁴ These statements show the grandeur which existed in some of the cities founded by the Romans, the remains of which are still found in different parts of Britain.

¹ Gibbon, ch. xxx., p. 483, and ch. xxx., p. 510—515.

² Freeman's *Norman Conquest*, vol. i., p. 19.

³ Gibbon, ch. xxxi., p. 528.

⁴ Giraldus Cambrensis, *Itinerary through Wales*, b. i., ch. v.

CHAPTER III.

CENTURY V.

SAINT PATRICK. THE PELAGIAN HERESY. BRITISH SCHOOLS OF LEARNING.

THE writer to whom we have formerly referred, though incredulous with regard to the strength of the British Church previously to the departure of the Romans, fully admits its vigour afterwards, and says the only ground for dispute is "whence this change arose." We would venture to suggest that this exhibition of its vitality when the nation was suffering from the loss of its Roman protectors, and the arrival of invading heathen leads to the conclusion that its previous strength and extent were greater than is supposed by our author.¹ That the British Church did not assist in spreading the gospel to other lands is unquestionable, but the absence of a missionary spirit amongst the Welsh may be accounted for by the warfare in which they were continually engaged with their Saxon neighbours.

In this respect her sister Church of Scotia² was very superior, and there is evidence that Christianity was planted there before the days of Patrick, her celebrated saint, who is popularly believed to have introduced the gospel into that island.³ We are informed by St. Jerome, and others who lived in this century, that the celebrated Celestius was by birth a Scot. Celestine, bishop of Rome, had sent Palladius to carry on missionary work in Scotia, but he retired to England about A.D. 431, as his mission had failed. He is said to have preached the gospel to the Picts, and to have been buried in Kincardineshire.

Fastidius, a Briton of some note, who was bishop of London about this time, was the author of some useful works, learned in the Scriptures, a good preacher, and a man of piety.⁴

Ninian, or Ninnias, was his contemporary, a native of North Wales, eminent for his learning. He went to Rome to perfect his education, and visited Martin, bishop of Tours, on his return. Ninnias devoted himself chiefly to the conversion of the southern Picts, and, being very successful in bringing them over to Christianity, fixed his see at Whitherne, or Candida Casa, in Galloway. Bede calls him "a most reverend bishop and holy man of the British nation," and says that he there built a church of stone, which was not usual amongst the Britons, whose churches, being generally built of wood, and thatched with reeds or straw, left no lasting record of their existence. Ninnias died A.D. 432.⁵

¹ See "The Churches of the British Confession," in Haddan's *Remains*, for the arguments on this subject.

² It will be remembered that Ireland is meant. ³ Haddan's *Remains*, p. 259.

⁴ Camden, p. 1257. Collier, vol. i., p. 98.

⁵ Bede, book iii., ch. iv., and note in same.

St. Patrick, who was born of Christian parents, is generally allowed to have been a native of North Britain, and is supposed to have been born about A.D. 382. When about sixteen years of age, he was taken prisoner by some pirates, and conveyed to Scotia, where he remained about six years, during which time he made himself well acquainted with the manners and language of the people. He was permitted to return to his native country, but is said to have had a great desire to become a missionary in Scotia. To prepare himself for this he passed into Gaul, and spent some time under the tuition of the celebrated Martin, bishop of Tours. Patrick was ordained by Germanus, bishop of Auxerre, and accompanied him in his visit to Britain; and it is said that he settled for a time in a small valley at Menevia, now St. David's, where there was a chapel dedicated to him.¹ St. Patrick preached in Britain for some time with great success, but his desire for the spiritual instruction of the Scots revived. Having been consecrated a bishop, he passed into Scotia, where he became one of the most celebrated and successful missionaries that ever appeared in that country. The following anecdote shows his gift of seizing easy examples to explain deep truths:—One day when trying to set forth the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, three persons in one God, his eye fell upon a shamrock or clover leaf, which he picked and held up; saying, "Here are three in one!"

After various wanderings Patrick settled at the place called Denein Sailrach, since named Armagh, where he founded a city, with church, schools, &c., with the view of making it the principal bishop's see in Scotia. Here and at Sabhul, near Downpatrick, he probably spent the remainder of his life; one of his last acts was to write a short narrative of himself, under the title of his confession.² This famous missionary was not the first to bring the light of the gospel into Ireland, but he has been called with justice the "apostle of the Irish, and the father of the Hibernian Church."³

The isle of Man was also indebted to St. Patrick for the introduction of Christianity about the middle of this century, and a bishopric was founded there. As this island lay midway between the northern part of Ireland and Britain, there was no small dispute as to which country it belonged. The difference was settled (so says the legend) by the following experiment:—Venomous creatures were brought to the island, and as they lived there, and none were found or would live in Ireland, the isle of Man was unanimously adjudged to belong to Britain.⁴

The heresy which disturbed the Church during this century was called Pelagianism, and was so named from Pelagius, a native of that part of Britain which we now call North Wales. He travelled to Rome, where he and his friend Celestius, before mentioned, met

¹ Dean Murray's *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, p. 25.

Rees's *Welsh Saints*, p. 129.

² Dean Murray, p. 31.

³ Mosheim, vol. i., p. 325.

⁴ Giraldus Cambrensis, *Topography of Ireland*, dist. ii., ch. xv.

with a companion, who appears to have suggested to them those opinions which have since been called the "Pelagian heresy," and are condemned in the ninth article of our Church. The denial that man is born in sin, and the assertion that he can attain the highest degree of piety by his own power, having no need of the help of the Holy Spirit, were the chief opinions of this sect. It does not appear that Pelagius revisited his native land, but he travelled with Celestius into different countries, where they spread abroad their opinions. They were not allowed to do so unreprieved, for Augustin, bishop of Hippo, near Carthage, in Africa, wrote against these doctrines, and did much towards checking them. Pelagius was the Latin name given to this Briton, and he was often called Pelagius Brito.¹

The heresy appears to have been brought into this country by Agricola, the son of a bishop, who was a follower of Pelagius, and it sadly corrupted the faith of the natives. The leading clergy remained firm to the truth; but as they could not oppose these errors successfully, they asked the assistance of their brethren in Gaul, who held a council to consider the subject, and then sent Germanus, bishop of Auxerre, and Lupus, bishop of Troyes, into Britain, A.D. 429. The authority of Germanus was very great in those times, and he employed it well; he was a person of quality, and enriched the Church by his gifts. After their arrival, Germanus and Lupus held a solemn conference at the famous city of Verulanum, now St. Alban's. Here they disputed with the Pelagians with such eloquence that the latter, unable to reply, confessed their errors. Bede says that Germanus and Lupus met with such success in their preaching while travelling through the country, that they left the Britons well settled in their ancient faith. In the beginning of the seventeenth century there was a small chapel standing, which is stated by some very ancient records in St. Alban's church to have been built on the spot where the Gallic bishops held their conference.²

During this time Britain suffered from the attacks of the Picts and Saxons, and the second visit of Germanus took place just before the arrival of the Saxon chiefs, Hengist and Horsa. It is supposed to have been about the year 447 that the bishop of Auxerre, having received information that certain persons were again attempting to spread the opinions of Pelagius, returned to this country, and brought with him Severus, who was a disciple of his former companion, Lupus. They found, however, that few had gone astray; the authors of the evil were discovered, their errors condemned, and the Christian faith in Britain continued long afterwards pure and untainted.³

Germanus, or Garmon, as he was called by the Britons, conferred another benefit on them by giving them the Gallican liturgy.

¹ Mosheim, vol. i., pp. 382, 383. Stillingfleet, ch. iv., pp. 181, 186.

² Bede, book i., ch. xvii. and xx. Camden, vol. i., p. 353.

³ Bede, book i., ch. xxi.

This is believed to have been derived from St. John, through his disciple the sainted Polycarp, who was bishop of Smyrna, and Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, in Gaul, the disciple of Polycarp.¹

We thus see how deeply the British Church was indebted to that of Gaul; whether it owed its existence in the first instance to that country, by the "simple spread of the gospel from the Gallic churches,"² or whether it may claim an origin from the east, through the disciples of St. John, or still earlier, from the apostle Paul, are questions into which we cannot enter. We only observe that if some enthusiastic writers have dwelt more strongly upon its earlier origin than is warranted by the evidence adduced, later writers seem to have passed into the opposite extreme. While they assert that the British Church up to the departure of the Romans was feeble and poor, with little strength or character of its own, it is acknowledged that the change to life and vigour after that date is remarkable and difficult to be accounted for.³ May not previous strength and power be presumed from this fact, though the materials by which to prove the case are necessarily scanty?

In the visits which Germanus paid to Britain, he observed that the decay of learning was one of the causes of the spread of false doctrine, and he therefore instituted schools or colleges amongst the Britons. Of these none were more famous than those of Dyfrig and Illtyd, to which a great number of scholars flocked. These teachers, better known under their Latin names of Dubricius and Illutus, are said to have been disciples of the bishop of Auxerre.⁴

Whilst the Roman empire flourished learning was encouraged, especially in the larger cities. Rome was the chief university of the world, to which students from all her provinces resorted. An edict is extant of the emperor Gratian, who reigned at the end of the fourth century, which required the chief cities of these parts of the Roman empire to maintain professors of both the Greek and Roman languages. The chief cities of the Roman provinces in Britain were London, York, and Caerleon; and as long as the Romans remained masters of the country, the Britons would have the same advantages as the inhabitants of other provinces of the empire. But when the Romans were withdrawn, and confusion caused by hostile invaders followed, Germanus's care in providing such places of instruction and study proved most seasonable in training up persons for the service of the Church, so far as the disorders and troubles of the times would admit.⁵

About the beginning of this century, the ecclesiastical system was undergoing a change, and the British Church seems to have been regulated after the model of that in Gaul. In the synod of Vaison, in that country, A.D. 442, a decree was made that country districts should have presbyters or priests to preach in them, as

¹ Stillingfleet, ch. iv., p. 216.

² See Haddan's *Remains*, p. 223.

³ See Haddan's *Remains*, p. 236.

⁴ Stillingfleet, ch. iv., p. 202—205.

⁵ Stillingfleet, ch. iv., p. 215.

was the case in churches in the cities; and to the influence of this decree the origin of country churches in Britain may perhaps be traced. It is probable that Germanus effected a beneficial change in the religious condition of the Britons from the influence he possessed and the respect accorded to him. Parochial churches did not belong to the earlier ages of Christianity. The clergy lived for some time in towns, under their bishops, from whence they travelled about the country, and brought back the offerings collected. No parish churches can be traced to a higher date than that of the first visit of Germanus, and those that claim to be so ancient are few.¹

The first churches would naturally be built in towns, where the greatest population was collected. When we consider how much of the country was covered with wood and forest, we can understand that the inhabitants would live in and near the towns for protection, or in the neighbourhood of their chiefs for the same purpose.

St. Augustin, bishop of Hippo, whom we have named as an opposer of the Pelagian heresy, was one of the learned fathers of the Church in the first part of this century, his writings being deservedly celebrated; and his treatise on catechizing contains advice which may be studied with advantage in the present day. His mother, Monica, was distinguished for her piety, and during her son's youth, when his habits and mode of life were sinful and immoral, she never ceased to pray for him. About A.D. 384 Augustin came to Milan, where St. Ambrose was at that time bishop, whose sermons, added to the tears and entreaties of his mother, effected his conversion. The example and instruction of Monica made a deep impression on the mind of her son, and the success which attended her counsels and her prayers has been brought forward as an encouragement to Christian mothers and an example of female influence.² Augustin was baptized by St. Ambrose, A.D. 387, when about 32 years of age. In the year 395 he became coadjutor to Valerius, bishop of Hippo, and the following year he succeeded him in the bishopric. Mosheim says, "The fame of Augustin, bishop of Hippo, filled the whole Christian world, and not without reason, as a variety of great and shining qualities were united in the character of that illustrious man." Shortly before his death he occupied himself in revising his works, about which time Africa was invaded by Genseric, king of the Vandals, who committed dreadful devastation, which must have deeply afflicted the good bishop. Augustin was taken away from the evil to come, having preached the Word of God constantly till his last sickness. He died during the siege of Hippo, A.D. 430, at the age of 76, and though he had neither money nor lands to dispose of, he left to the Church that which was more valuable than either—his library.³

¹ Rees's *Welsh Saints*, p. 131, and *ibid.* from Bingham's *Ecclesiastical Antiquities*, b. ix., ch. viii., sec. 1.

² *Character*, by S. Smiles, p. 38.

³ Milner, p. 353. Mosheim, vol. i., p. 267.

CHAPTER IV.

CENTURIES V. AND VI.

ARRIVAL OF THE SAXONS, A.D. 449.

AFTER the departure of the Romans from Britain, several petty sovereigns appear to have divided the country between them; they were probably descendants of the old chieftains who formerly bore rule in the island. Though our countrymen had advanced in civilization, they seem to have relied so much upon their Roman conquerors as to have in a great measure lost the power of defending themselves. Jealousies and divisions, at all times the bane of the Celtic inhabitants, appear to have been the leading causes of the misfortunes that overtook them, to which we must add the more enterprising and persevering spirit of their invaders. The disputes which arose between these British princes were very frequent, and in order to correct this evil, it appears that one of them was made supreme ruler, with the assistance of a council of other chiefs. He was called in the British language *penteyrn*, which word was afterwards turned into *pendragon*. It signified head king. Gwrtheyrn, or Vortigern, is named as the one in power at the period of which we are writing. A terrible disease now raged amongst the people, and the country was ravaged by its foes. Vortigern having all these evils to contend with, held a council to consider the best means of getting rid of their enemies, the Picts.

Whilst thus engaged, three Saxon or Jutish vessels arrived from Germany, A.D. 449, whose crews landed in the isle of Thanet, in Kent, probably for the purpose of plunder, like their fathers before them; for the Saxon and their kindred tribes had been attacking Britain, plundering when they arrived unexpectedly, but defeated when they met with resistance. The Saxon leaders on this occasion were two brothers, named Hengist and Horsa. It was determined by the British chieftains to employ the strangers to assist them against their northern enemies. As their number was small, Hengist advised Vortigern to send for more of his countrymen; this advice was adopted, and the new comers acted for a time with the British prince; but feeling their superior strength, they soon quarrelled with the Britons, and not content with the isle of Thanet, they took and kept possession of what is now called the county of Kent, which they formed into a kingdom, and there the descendants of Hengist and his followers remained. By the end of the century two other parties had landed, and established themselves in Sussex and in Hampshire. But they were not allowed peaceable possession—far from it—sometimes the natives,¹

¹ Sharon Turner's *History of the Anglo Saxons*, vol. i., p. 242—246.
Bede, b. i., ch. xvi.

sometimes their enemies conquered, says Bede, who took his account from Gildas, the monk of Bangor.

About A.D. 586, the last division of the invaders came to Britain; these were the largest and strongest portion of the intruders, and were called Angles. They came from Schleswig and Jutland, which form part of the present kingdom of Denmark. The Saxons came from farther south, near the river Elbe, but they were kindred tribes.¹

The British prince Arthur, so celebrated in song and story, and of whom so many wonderful legends have been told, was pendragon when one of these invasions took place, and he is said to have obtained a great victory over the Saxons at Baden Hills. He was a prince in some part of Britain near the southern coast, and was buried at Glastonbury, in Somersetshire. In the year 1189, search was made for his body by order of King Henry II., who twice visited Wales, and had been informed by a British bard that king Arthur was interred at Glastonbury, and that some pyramids marked the place. There his remains were discovered. They found a rude leaden cross, on which was an inscription in latin, and nine feet below this was found a coffin, made of hollowed oak, wherein were the bones of Arthur. The translation of the inscription is as follows:—

“Here lies buried the renowned king Arthur, in the island of Avalon.”

The bones were removed into the great church at Glastonbury, and deposited in a magnificent shrine, which was visited in 1276 by king Edward I. and his queen.²

The exploits of Arthur are mentioned by the celebrated bard Llywarch Hen, his guest and counsellor; also by the bards Taliesin and Myrddin. The latter is the Merlin of the old romances. The two former appear to have been natives of the northern parts of Britain. So also was Aneurin, called the king of the bards,³ who was a chieftain in a district between the Humber and the Clyde, called Rheged. The writings of these bards still exist, and their names are well known in Wales.

The Saxons settled chiefly in the southern and south eastern coast. Their kingdoms were known as the south, the east, and the west, the latter of which occupied an important position. The Jutes formed no other state than Kent. The Angles came not only to the south eastern part of Scotland, but extended themselves over the north eastern and midland counties of England, and

¹ Sharon Turner, vol. i., p. 272—274. At p. 93 this author traces the origin of the Teutonic races of Europe to the east of the Araxis and the borders of the Caspian sea, quoting from Homer, Herodotus, &c. This is one of the foundations on which bishop Titcomb and others found their ingenious and interesting theory of our descent from the lost tribes of Israel.

² Sharon Turner, vol. i., p. 272—274, and pp. 280, 281. The isle of Avalon was situated in a marshy tract, now Glastonbury, in Somersetshire. We have quoted from the eloquent author of the *Anglo-Saxon History*; but the very existence of Arthur is doubted by many writers.

³ Sharon Turner, vol. i., p. 294.

eventually gave their name to the whole country as Anglesland, or England.

The Britons maintained a long and brave struggle, but it was disorderly and ill conducted, with no united action, for the British princes were often on bad terms with each other, and sometimes viewed the misfortunes of a rival with satisfaction. Nearly a hundred and fifty years passed between the arrival of Hengist and his Jutes and the final settlement of the invaders. It cannot be said in what year each British principality was destroyed, or each county subdued; but the intruders had always to fight their way with perseverance and difficulty from the sea coast where they landed to the inland provinces. They found in Britain a stubborn and national resistance; but the numbers and the determination of the invaders led to success, and they spread their own language in the parts which they occupied, and retained for a time the heathen worship of their fathers.

The Britons, though not exterminated, were forced to retire to more distant parts. They retained possession of the district between the Humber and the Clyde, on the western coast, for some time after the Saxon invasion, and a large portion of it was afterwards called Cumbria, from which are derived the names of Cumberland and Cambria. The most noted of the British race who retained their possessions in these parts were the Ystrad Clwyd Britons, who held what was called the Strathclyde kingdom, which stretched from Dumbarton to Chester. Cornwall and Devonshire were also independent, and were known as West Wales. Many of the Britons emigrated into Armorica or Brittany, where some of their countrymen had previously settled. Others retired into that western portion of Britain which we now call Wales, which name is derived from a Teutonic root signifying 'foreign.' The Teutonic invaders of Britain called the natives Wälsche or Wealhas, as they did all foreigners, and thus the name of Wales was attached to the country, and that of Welsh to the people.

That great peninsula which was called West Wales, is largely inhabited by men who are descendants of the old Welsh inhabitants. The Britons retained their own kingdom or principality in those parts till the reign of Egbert, and even to that of Alfred, in the ninth century, and the Cornish language has become extinct within comparatively recent times. It is worthy of note that in 904 the Cornish Church is spoken of as being in error, its claim to independence apparently causing this censure and correction from Rome.¹

The British bards consoled the people with the hope that the day would arrive when they would have their revenge, by driving out the Saxon hordes. Myrddin promised the Britons that they should again be victorious, and thus Taliesin sang—

¹ Sharon Turner, vol. i., pp. 304, 310, 285. Taylor's *Words and Places*, pp. 42, 43.

² Freeman's *Norman Conquest*, vol. i., p. 34. Collier, vol. i., p. 403.

“ Their Lord they shall praise,
Their language preserve,
Their country lose,
Except wild Wales,
Till the destined period of their triumph revolves.
Then the Britons will obtain
The crown of their land,
And the strange people
Will vanish away.”

But the invaders mocked the prophecy, and their active hardy race at length carried the Saxon sceptre even to consecrated Anglesey. But the Britons long maintained their struggle against the progress of the Saxons. In an important battle which took place in Gloucestershire, three British princes fell, two of whom seem to be those lamented by the bard Llywarch Hen in one of his elegies. The capture of the cities of Gloucester, Cirencester, and Bath, cities then of considerable note, were the fruits of the Saxon victory.¹ It has been observed that these details of repeated struggles shew the strength of the British population. Had they not been nearly equal to the Saxons, such a stubborn resistance could not have been maintained.

The Anglo-Saxon kingdoms in Britain fluctuated in number, being sometimes more and sometimes less than seven; nevertheless seven kingdoms are more conspicuous than others, and from these alone arose candidates for the dominion of the whole island. The following list gives a fair idea of those portions which composed what has been called the Saxon Heptarchy:—

The kingdom of Kent was formed A.D. 449, by the Jutes under Hengist, who also settled in the isle of Wight.

The south Saxons, under Ella, formed the kingdom of Sussex, A.D. 477.

The west Saxons, A.D. 519, under Cerdic, formed the kingdom of Wessex, consisting of Hampshire, Berkshire, Wiltshire, Dorsetshire, and afterwards extending into the peninsula called West Wales.

The east Saxons formed the kingdom containing Essex and Middlesex, A.D. 526.

The Angles formed the kingdom of Northumbria, which was sometimes united under a single prince, and sometimes divided into the two kingdoms of Bernicia and Deira. The first king recorded is Ida, A.D. 547. Northumbria extended from the Humber to the Forth on the eastern side of the island. The Britons retaining the western part, called Strathclyde.

The kingdom of the east Angles comprised Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridge; and the first recorded king is Offa, A.D. 571. This country, between the fens and the German ocean, received from these settlers the name of East Anglia. It is thought that the fen country retained parties of Britons till a late date.

In the middle of Britain arose another Anglian kingdom, which

¹ Sharon Turner, vol. i., pp. 312, 313.

formed that of Mercia, and which became, by the end of the sixth century, a powerful state, though the date of its origin is not distinctly recorded. Mercia became the *march*, or border-land, against the Welsh.

Such were the divisions of Teutonic Britain at the end of the sixth century, though it must not be supposed that they contained compact monarchies. The sovereign of one or other of these states sometimes acquiring a dominion over the rest, the famous title of *bretwalda* appears to have been borne by the princes in whom such a supremacy was vested. The union of the Anglo-Saxon race being at last carried out by the west Saxon kings of the ninth and tenth centuries, from Wessex has grown England, Great Britain, and the British empire. All our earlier kings were descended from Cerdic, the west Saxon, in the male line—all our later sovereigns from the same ancestor in the female line.¹

The account of the Saxon settlement in England has been completed in this chapter, in order that we may return to the affairs of the Church without interruption in the next.

¹ See Freeman, vol. i., p. 22—28 ; also Sharon Turner, vol. i., ch. i. and iv. The Angle, says Freeman, gave his name to the country ; from the Saxon came the royal dynasty ; and the Jute, in Kent, supplied the ecclesiastical centre—the spiritual metropolis of Canterbury. But long before the Normans came, these tribes were fused into one nation, vol. i., p. 22.

CHAPTER V.

CENTURIES V. AND VI.

MONASTERIES. SYNOD OF BREFI. ST. DAVID. IONA.

As we shall frequently have occasion to speak of monasteries and their inmates, this may be a convenient time to trace the origin of these important communities. The term 'hermit'¹ was applied to those religious persons who separated themselves from their fellow men and led a solitary life; that of monk to those who, though separating themselves from the world, lived together under certain religious rules; their abode being called a monastery, and their ruler or chief an abbot. The first society of monks was formed by Anthony, in Egypt, who lived during the reign of Constantine the Great, and who followed to the letter our Lord's words, "Sell that thou hast and give to the poor." St. Matthew xix. 21. Anthony was young and rich when he thus retired from the world, and he continued in this seclusion until his death at the age of 105, only leaving his retreat during the Diocletian persecution, and again during the Arian heresy, when he came to Alexandria to strengthen the faith of his brethren, thus exposing himself to danger for their sakes. His life was written by Athanasius, the patriarch of Alexandria.²

The monastic system was introduced into Asia Minor by St. Basil, afterwards bishop of Cæsarea, who died A.D. 378, and his code of law was the foundation of all monastic rules. It enjoined poverty, obedience, and chastity.

The first monasteries in Europe were established in Italy, about the middle of the fifth century, and in Gaul by Martin, the celebrated bishop of Tours. The monastic system was carried by his pupil and friend, St. Patrick, into Scotia. The early monks spent their time in visiting the poor, preaching the gospel, teaching the young, and attending the sick. The insecurity of the times required such retreats, and the monasteries were not only schools of learning, but homes for learned men, whence many heralds of salvation went forth to evangelize the country.³ The evils and corruptions of monastic life belonged to future years and other influences.

An important difference existed between the monks of the eastern and the western churches. The solitary life of the former developed into morbid contemplation, of which the results have been ignorance and decay. The missionary zeal and activity of the latter, and the system which made their monasteries educa-

¹ Derived from *eremite*, a dweller in the deserts.

² Mosheim, vol. i., p. 278. Milner, p. 228.

³ Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 97.

tional colleges for the clergy, and in part for the laity, contributed to preserve their life and vigour. It is true that as time went on they became transformed into a large body of landholders—into wealthy luxurious corporations, which process paved the way for their corruption, and eventually in England to their fall; but in their earlier stage they were busy combinations of working clergy;¹ and their self-denial, their unworldly devotion, their zeal in spreading the light of the gospel, are worthy of imitation, amid the busy idleness and wide-spread luxury which prevails so largely amongst our wealthy classes in the present day.

The principle of combining bodies of clergy into a collegiate life, subject to a plain unworldly rule, but free from the irrevocable vow, is one which is beginning to be adopted in this nineteenth century as a means of overcoming the wild and depraved habits of our densely populated centres.² The value of female assistance has also been recognized, as has been shewn by the sisterhoods established of late years, the members of which devote themselves to works of charity. The leisure and capacity possessed by many ladies render the extension of such means of usefulness desirable while regulated in accordance with the sober tone of our Church.

The colleges (or monasteries) founded by Germanus in Britain were a proof of his wisdom, as by their means the Church did not become devoid of learning, even when its members were obliged to leave their homes and take refuge in distant localities as the invading Saxons advanced and gained ground.³ These nurseries to the Church in Britain were invaluable. The ancient British word for them, *côr*, signified choir (Bangor=high choir), but it has generally been translated as 'college.' Little is known of their internal regulations, but it appears that choral services formed an important part of their arrangements.⁴

Two places are mentioned where Dubricius instructed his pupils; Henllan and Muchros, both on the banks of the Wye. He and Germanus are supposed to have founded the monasteries of Caerworgorn, Llancarfan, and Caerleon. Both had probably something to do with the work, though Dubricius must have been a young man when the bishop of Auxerre paid his second visit to Britain, as he lived into the sixth century. Ilutut is said to have been the first abbot of Caerworgorn, which place is now called Llantwit Major, in Glamorganshire.⁵ The first principal or abbot of Llancarfan was Cattwg, the son of a chieftain in Monmouthshire, of whom it is recorded that he chose a life of religion and learning rather than the succession to his father's possessions. On account of his wisdom he has been called "Cattwg Ddoeth," or "Cattwg the Wise." A collection of his maxims and moral sayings is preserved both in prose and verse. He lived into the sixth century, having

¹ See Haddan's *Remains*, p. 202, on the "Monks of the West."

² See Haddan's *Remains*, p. 203.

³ Stillingfleet, ch. iv., p. 205.

⁴ Rees's *Welsh Saints*, p. 181.

⁵ Rees's *Welsh Saints*, p. 178. Stillingfleet, p. 205.

attained a great age, and is considered to have been one of the founders of churches.¹

A contemporary of these was Paulinus, or Pawl Hen (the latter word meaning 'aged'), who was a native of North Wales, and lived for some time in the isle of Man, which had been converted to Christianity by St. Patrick. From thence he went to Caerworgorn, and afterwards founded the college or abbey of Tygwyn-ar-Daf, or Whitland, in Carmarthenshire, of which he was the first abbot. The place soon became well known, and St. David, with his friend Teilo, and others, remained there to receive instruction from Pawl Hen, who was distinguished for his acquaintance with the Scriptures.²

The oldest churches in Wales are called after certain persons reputed to be their founders, who lived principally in the fifth and sixth centuries. That they were men of holy lives is recorded in all the scanty accounts we have of them, but their names are more especially handed down to us as those of founders of churches. They were the better enabled to confer those blessings on their country, as they were often related to the chiefs, and the churches they founded were situated in the territories of the head of their family or tribe. Others who were not so related are ascertained to have bestowed this benefit in places connected with their own history. It is recorded of Cunedda Wledig, a chieftain in North Britain, that he gave "lands to God and the saints." It is not stated what particular churches or religious houses were endowed by him. The latter are evidently alluded to by the expression "lands—to the saints." They were probably in that part of Britain of which he was a native; but the changes which took place there swept away all traces of them.³

We may here mention that those Welsh churches which have the word *llan* prefixed to them are of the oldest foundation. The word *capel*, as well as *bettws*, is applied to those of more recent date.⁴

The family most distinguished in the British Church in this century is that of Brychan, of whom Dyfrig, or Dubricius, was a grandson. The names of several of the children of Brychan are recorded as founders of churches; a daughter, Clydai, is the reputed founder of Clydey, in Pembrokeshire, and another daughter, Tydfil, is famous as having given her name to one of the centres of the South Wales iron works, Merthyr Tydfil, near which spot she suffered martyrdom at the hands of the Saxons, in memory of which event the place has borne her name. Cynllo was another benefactor of the Church in those days, and is named as the founder of the churches of Llangynllo and Llangoedmore, in Cardiganshire. Cynllo belonged to a powerful family, and was probably himself a chieftain; he afterwards adopted the monastic life.⁵

¹ Stillingfleet, p. 176.

² Rees's *Welsh Saints*, p. 187.

³ Rees, pp. 64, 108, 114.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁵ Rees, pp. 133, 136, 151, 172.

These appear to be the most noted names connected with the British Church in this century. If it be asked whether there were any in other parts of the island whose good deeds deserve to be remembered, no records exist of them, and we must recollect that during this period the Saxons had settled in Kent, and the south and west Saxon kingdoms were forming. By reference to the last chapter it will be seen that the inhabitants of the counties which comprised these kingdoms were fully occupied with war and invasion. Wales and Strathclyde, or the greater part of those divisions, were free from the intruders, and the records of Llandaff were not destroyed as those in other parts of the country were.

In this century, six sons of Muridus, a prince in what is now the province of Ulster, with a large number of followers, sailed from Scotia and took possession of that part of Caledonia or Albania, on the coast of Argyleshire, now called the Mull of Cantyre, and from these Scots settlers the name of Scotland is derived. It is, however, said by some writers that the inhabitants of that part of Scotland and the north of Ireland were kindred tribes of Scots;¹ and it is remarkable that whilst the name of the Picts, who inhabited by far the larger portion of the country, is lost, the Scots have given their name to the whole; also that in Ireland the name of Scotia and the Scots became extinct, the country deriving the name of Ireland from Ierne, which was at first only a portion of it.²

Some time during this century Cornwall was visited by a missionary from Scotia named Piranus, who came for the purpose of converting those who were still pagans. He fixed his abode on the north-western coast of Cornwall, at a place now called Perranzabuloe, which means St. Pieran in the sand,³ and close to a spring of water that still bears his name. Even at this day his memory is cherished in Cornwall. He was a benefactor of the souls and bodies of those whose ignorance he enlightened. On this spot, in the decline of years, having "finished his course and kept the faith," he breathed his last, and here his flock erected with their own hands a church inscribed with his name. During the troubled time of the Saxon and Danish invasions, little is known of the history of St. Pieran's church beyond the fact that time did not diminish the reputation of the saint. As pilgrimages increased, rich offerings were laid on St. Pieran's tomb. The church was endowed with estates, and King Henry I., who came to the throne A.D. 1100, made it a royal gift to the cathedral of Exeter.

But the church became hidden from the gaze of man—buried beneath the hillocks of sand which the north west wind, "the tyrant of this coast," as Camden calls it, has spread to a great

¹ Giraldus Cambrensis, *Topography of Ireland*, dist. iii., secs. 7 and 16, and note to ch. xvi.

² Gibbon, ch. xxv., p. 403.

³ In the old Cornish language it is 'Pieran in treth.'

extent over the meadows of the parish, though there is reason to believe that it was not entirely buried till the twelfth century. Many attempts were made to restore it to the light of day. At length, in 1835, a gentleman near Truro resolutely put his hand to the work; and, in spite of the clouds of sand that whirled around, this ancient British church was displayed, to the gratitude of Cornishmen and to the satisfaction of antiquarians. Without doubt it is one of the earliest specimens of stone building that superseded the mud-wattled walls of the first British churches. With the exception of its roof and doors, it was as perfect as when first erected; the masonry very rude, but solid and compact. It appears never to have contained more than two small windows. The doorway was in high preservation. At the eastern end was a neat but simple altar tomb, on removing which three skeletons were discovered, one of which no doubt was that of St. Piranus. They were carefully replaced in their narrow cell. The church contained a very curious stone font. This had been happily transferred to a second church, which was built half a mile further off, but the sandy encroachments had again compelled the inhabitants to remove, and to build a third church, this time placed three miles off, which was consecrated by the bishop of Exeter in 1805. The old enemy is still at work around the ancient church, and the sand accumulates so deeply as once more to threaten the entire disappearance of the building. This interesting account is taken from a little work called *Perranzabuloe*, by the Rev. C. T. Collins Trelawny, M.A.

As the early British Church was so deeply indebted to its neighbours in Gaul, we must not pass by their troubles during this century without mention; for they, as well as ourselves, suffered from invasion. The hordes of barbarians that swarmed from the east, and spread over the west of Europe, almost extinguished the names of the old inhabitants; and in forming new kingdoms out of the old Roman provinces the footsteps of the invaders were marked by fire, sword, and desolation.

Whilst the Roman empire continued, its governors, soldiers, and people were dispersed through the greater part of Europe; and the Roman language prevailed in the provinces. The semi-barbarous nations who displaced them were unacquainted with the latin language, and, except amongst the learned, it gradually fell into disuse.

The Goths had settled in the southern portion of Gaul; their king resided at Toulouse. The barbarous and pagan Huns, under their king, Attila, who had harassed the eastern empire, committed dreadful ravages in Gaul. The greater part of the Gallic cities were besieged and stormed by him and his allies, the Franks. Attila advanced into the heart of the country, and besieged Orleans; but here the people were animated with courage by their bishop, Anianus. He induced them to hold out until their expected help arrived, and sent trusty messengers to observe the distant country. At last help was seen advancing. "It is the aid of God," said the good bishop; "It is the aid of God," repeated the people. The

Gothic king appeared from southern Gaul; the city of Orleans was saved, and Attila was defeated in a great battle. He then passed into Italy, and threatened Rome. The bishop of Rome, Leo I., exposed his life for the safety of his flock. Clad in his bishop's robes, his appearance and eloquence excited the veneration of Attila, who, on the promise of a large sum of money, left Italy. This was about A.D. 450. The inhabitants of Gaul were not long left in peace, for Clovis, a leader of the Franks, invaded the country, defeated the Burgundians, who had taken possession of a portion of it, and also overcame the Goths in the south. His progress was slow, but he gradually established his rule; and his successors, like the Saxons in Britain, formed the country by degrees into a kingdom, which derived the name of France from that of his tribe.

The Gauls had still their seats of learning, and the latin language continued to be familiar to them. The rough manners and the ignorance of the new comers formed a great contrast to the peaceful and more polished Gauls.¹

Clovis and his followers were pagans; but his wife, Clotilda, daughter of the Burgundian king, was a Christian, and she tried to convert her husband, but without success. He, however, allowed their first child to be baptized; but its early death caused Clovis to exclaim, "I have lost my child because I had him devoted to your Deity." The queen replied, "I thank God that he has thought me worthy to bear a child whom he has called into his kingdom." Meantime the Christian churches stood their ground, and the native Christians sowed the seed of the gospel amongst the strangers; for the zeal of the bishops and the holy lives of many pious men, by displaying the beauty of their religion, made a deep impression on their invaders.

On one occasion, when Clovis was engaged in war with a German tribe, his soldiers were giving way, and his affairs seemed desperate; he then implored the assistance of Christ, and vowed that if he gained a victory Christ should be his God. The victory was his, and, faithful to his vow, he gave up his heathen gods, and became a Christian, being baptized towards the end of the year, at the town of Rheims, after he had been instructed in the truths of the gospel. Many of his followers were baptized at the same time; and when the bishop preached to them on the sufferings endured by our Lord at the hands of Pilate and the Jews, Clovis could not forbear crying out, "If I had been there with my Franks, that should not have happened."²

These constant wars and the calamities which attended them were injurious to the progress of Christianity; the Church, however, continued to gain ground both in the eastern and western empires. Leo, bishop of Rome, surnamed the Great, whose influence checked Attila in his attack on that city, was one of the chief

¹ Gibbon, ch. xxxv., pp. 570, 576, and xxxviii., p. 618.

² Mosheim, vol. i., p. 323, and note in the same.

men of his time, earnest and charitable, possessing great talents and eloquence, and not deficient in zealous endeavours to increase the power and authority of his see.¹

Gaul was now lost to the Roman empire. Augustulus, the last of the emperors of the west, was conquered by the Heruli, a barbarous tribe, under their chief Odoacer. A few years later the emperor of the east, who reigned at Constantinople, employed Theodoric and his Ostrogoths to expel these invaders, and to recover the remnant of the western empire, by which means Theodoric obtained a kingdom in Italy, of which Ravenna was the capital. This new monarchy was nominally under the control of the eastern emperors, but in reality it was independent, leaving only the shadow of authority and power to those sovereigns.

We now take leave of the Roman emperors, but the power of Rome was not lost; it rose again in a different form, and we shall see the steps by which it acquired its influence over the minds and souls of men. Many causes contributed to increase the authority of the bishops of Rome, of which one was the declining power of the empire. The jealousy existing between the rival cities of Rome and Constantinople was another. In the religious disputes which arose in the capital of the eastern empire, the Roman bishops were often appealed to by those who were unwilling to submit to the patriarch of Constantinople, and the former took advantage of the circumstance to augment their importance.² Again, Rome was, as it were, the custodian of knowledge to the western world; as most of the books written by the ancients and many of the writings of the early fathers of the Christian Church were kept in her public libraries. This naturally produced in men's minds, and especially amongst the educated class, a feeling of reverence for Rome which could not be experienced for any other European city; and this sentiment was extended to her bishops. Even the incursions of the barbarous tribes contributed to the advancement of the Roman see; for their leaders, perceiving the influence possessed by its bishop, sought to reconcile him to their interests by loading him with honour. Such are some of the causes which operated to swell the power acquired by these ambitious prelates.

In Britain the Church was again troubled by the Pelagian heresy. Dubricius, whose monasteries or colleges we have mentioned, became bishop of Llandaff, and afterwards bishop of Caerleon.³ Some Welsh writers have claimed an archbishopric or primacy for Caerleon, and afterwards for St. David's; but it would appear that this authority was not vested in either of the Welsh bishoprics, and its absence, contrary to the customs of Rome, is one of the proofs of the independent origin of the British Church.

¹ Mosheim, vol. i., p. 320—344.

² Mosheim, vol. i., pp. 320, 339.

³ Rees's *Welsh Saints*, p. 172.

A synod was called by Dubricius to check this heresy, at which the bishops and abbots, together with the princes and other laymen of the Church, assembled at Brefi, in the county of Cardigan. When many discourses had been delivered, Pawl Hen entreated that David, who had been his pupil at Tygwyn-ar-Daf (Whitland), might be sent for. He came, and spoke with such eloquence that the advocates of the heresy were vanquished.¹ Brefi was afterwards called Llan-ddewi-brefi, in honour of the saint. Dubricius, worn with years, resigned his see, and withdrew to the island of Enlli or Bardsey, where he died, A.D. 522. Mention is made of the retirement of Dubricius to the island of Bardsey by a poet of that age, in the following verse:—

“ Pan oedh Saint Senedh Bhrevi
Drwy arch y prophwydi
Ar ôl gwiw bregeth Dewi,
Yn myned i ynys Enlli,” &c.²

His remains were removed by Urban, bishop of Llandaff, with the permission of David, bishop of Bangor, and interred with great honour, A.D. 1120, in Llandaff cathedral, which had been rebuilt a short time before.³ Two counties contend for the honour of the birth of Dyfrig—Pembrokeshire, at a place near Fishguard; and Herefordshire, at Muchros, on the Wye. Probably the latter was the place, as he selected that locality for the scene of his labours.⁴ It is scarcely necessary to observe that these border counties were still in possession of the Welsh.

The synod of Llan-ddewi-brefi is supposed to have been held about A.D. 520. In the adjoining parish of Caio was a stone, which from its inscription appears to have commemorated the last resting-place of the holy Pawl Hen.⁵

Dubricius made Daniel or Deiniol the first bishop of Bangor. With regard to the monastery of Bangor Iscoed, there is some difference of opinion as to the time of its foundation; but it was one of the most celebrated in the island of Britain, and our ancient writer, Gildas, was a member of it.⁶

During this and the succeeding centuries much was done by the missionary zeal of the Scots. It has been recorded that “Ireland was full of saints,” and it has been well observed that “fortune has played a perverse trick to modern Irish Romanism” by bringing to the light an independent early Church of that island, flourishing ere the papal claims were advanced, and long ere they

¹ Rees, p. 192, from Giraldus's *Life of St. David*.

² Camden, vol. ii., p. 767.

³ Rees, p. 192. See also Haddan's article on the Liber Landavensis in the *Archæologia Cambrensis* for July, 1868. Reprinted in Haddan's *Remains*, p. 239.

⁴ Rees's *Welsh Saints*, p. 171.

⁵ Rees, p. 188. In a note to this page it is remarked that “this relic of antiquity is now removed for preservation to Dolau Cothi, the seat of J. Johnes, Esq.” The late Mr. Johnes was distinguished for the interest he took in the antiquities and past history of Cambria.

⁶ Stillingfleet, ch. iv., p. 202. Camden, vol. i., p. 665.

were established, and carrying the pure light of the gospel to other lands by means of her zealous missionaries. We shall find St. Columba, the apostle of the Albanian Scots and northern Picts; St. Aidan, the apostle of the Northumbrian Saxons; St. Columbanus, the apostle of the Burgundians of Alsace; St. Gall, in northern Switzerland; St. Kilian, in Thuringia; Virgilius, in Carinthia; Catheldus, in Tarentum; amongst the missionaries who went forth from the Church of the ancient Scotia between the latter part of the sixth and the early years of the eighth centuries; and it was from this source that the first Anglo-Saxon missionaries derived their zeal.¹ Papal supremacy was not established in Ireland until the twelfth century, when an English king entered that country at the bidding of an English pope;² yet the Irish Romanists now cling to the supremacy thus derived as closely as though the doctrine were of native growth.

David, the celebrated Welsh saint, was elected to the bishopric of Caerleon as successor to Dubricius. His friend, Teilo, was appointed bishop of Llandaff. St. David is supposed to have received his early religious education in the school or monastery of Illutus, and afterwards in that of Pawl Hen, at Tygwyn-ar-Daf, where Teilo was one of his fellow students. David is said to have been present at a victory obtained by king Arthur over the Saxons, and an old legend connected with this event assigns a reason for Welshmen ornamenting their hats with a leek on the first of March, which is the day dedicated to the saint. After the battle, David and his companions found themselves on a spot where a quantity of leeks grew, which they pulled, and placed on their heads. Another version of the story is that they wore the leek in their caps during the battle as a distinction or badge, and thus it is now worn on St. David's day, in memory of the victory and in honour of the saint. It is said by Giraldus that David was born at the place since called St. David's; and it is admitted that he founded or restored a monastery in the valley of Rosina, which was afterwards called Menevia. In this retirement his time was devoted to prayer, and he was first roused from his seclusion to attend the synod of Brefi. It is recorded that he accepted the bishopric with reluctance, but was afterwards distinguished for his activity. The Pelagian doctrines not being entirely suppressed, David held another synod at Caerleon, when his exertions were so successful that the heresy was crushed. This meeting has been named the "synod of victory."³ Copies of the proceedings at both synods were sent to most of the churches. After these councils David drew up rules for the regulation of the British Church; a copy of which remained in the cathedral of St. David's until it was lost in an incursion of pirates.⁴ Under David's presidency the cause of religion greatly prospered, and, to use the words of

¹ See Haddan's *Remains*, "The Scots on the Continent," p. 258—294.

² Henry II. and Nicholas Breakspear. Pope Adrian IV.

³ Rees's *Welsh Saints*, p. 194—196.

⁴ Collier, vol. i., p. 137. Rees, p. 196.

Giraldus, "in those times, in the territory of Cambria, the Church of God flourished exceedingly, and ripened with much fruit every day. David informed them by words, and instructed them by example."

After his elevation to the bishopric, David resided for a while at Caerleon; he then returned to Menevia, since called St. David's. No reason is given for this; it probably proceeded only from his early attachment to the place, or that he preferred its solitude for the advantage of contemplation.¹

Here he is supposed to have died, at an advanced age, A.D. 544. His shrine was so famous that it was visited not only from all parts of Wales, but also from foreign countries. Three of the kings of England are recorded to have undertaken the journey to St. David's, namely, William I., Henry II., and Edward I.; the last of whom was accompanied by his queen Eleanor, A.D. 1284. The shrine still remains in the fine old cathedral. Teilo, bishop of Llandaff, was, as has been said, the friend and companion of St. David. The town of Llandilo, in Carmarthenshire, derives its name from him.²

St. Bridget, or St. Bride, though of Irish origin, has been held in great respect in the principality; several churches and chapels being dedicated to her, under the name of Bride or Ffraid. There is a vague tradition that she visited Wales; but veneration for her has, for some unknown cause, been so widely diffused that churches have been consecrated to her memory throughout England and Scotland, in the isle of Man, and in the Hebrides. Her memory was especially cherished at Kildare. She is supposed to have died about A.D. 525.³

Tyssul was the founder of the churches of Llandyssul, in Cardiganshire, and in Montgomeryshire; and Dogfael of St. Dogmel's, in Pembrokeshire, near the mouth of the Tivy.⁴ Here an abbey was afterwards built by the Benedictine monks, and a portion of its ruins still remains.

We have mentioned that many Britons took refuge in Armorica, and there appears to have been frequent intercourse with that country. In the beginning of this century Cadvan, with Padarn and others, came from thence to Britain. It is supposed that they did so in consequence of the Franks, under Clovis, threatening that part of Gaul. Cadvan founded the church of Tywyn, in Merionethshire. In the churchyard of that place, some years ago, were two rude pillars, one of which, in the shape of a wedge, about seven feet high, having a cross and an inscription on it, went by the name of St. Cadvan's stone, and was considered to have been a part of his tomb.⁵ Padarn, soon after his arrival, became a member of the college of Iltutus. He established a small reli-

¹ Rees, p. 197. Collier, vol. i., p. 137.

² Rees, pp. 200, 202, 245.

³ Rees, p. 189.

⁴ Ibid., pp. 209, 211.

⁵ Rees, pp. 213, 215.

gious society at a place in Cardiganshire, near Aberystwyth, since called Llanbadarn-fawr. Its name denotes its connection with the "great Padarn," who became the first bishop of this place, over which he presided for twenty-one years. How long it remained a bishopric cannot be ascertained, but it is said to have lost its privileges through the turbulent conduct of its inhabitants, and it was annexed to the see of St. David's.¹ It is recorded in the Triads, which are very ancient British writings, that Padarn preached the faith of Christ without pay or reward to all ranks of people, and that the three blessed visitors of the isle of Britain were David, Padarn, and Teilo.² Cybi is thought to have been present at the synod of Brefi, and if so, he was a contemporary of St. David. He built churches, but is more especially distinguished as the founder and head of a religious society at Caergybi, in Anglesey, which place is now called Holyhead, though in Welsh it retains its original appellation.³

These holy men appear to have lived during the first half of the sixth century. By referring to chapter four we shall see that by this time the Saxons had made great progress, and had formed five of their kingdoms in Britain, and that the sixth division of these invaders had landed in the northern part of the island.

Petroc was the son of a Cornish prince, and being a man of great piety, he took care to promote the interests of Christianity. The town of Petrocstow, or Padstow, derives its name from him. He went into Ireland, where he remained many years studying divinity; and when he returned to his own country, being well qualified as a teacher, he settled in a monastery, near the Severn, where he had several pupils. There was a monument to him in the town of Bodmin, in Cornwall.⁴

Saint Columba, or Columbkil, which signifies 'dove of the Church,' was an Irish Scot, a native of Ulster, and related to those early Scots settlers in Argyleshire previously mentioned. He was a Culdee, which term appears to have been applied to the first British monks, and meant 'servant of God,' or 'dweller in cells.' It did not refer to any particular order; but wherever the Celtic language was used the monks were designated as Culdees, and they were venerated as patrons of learning and sanctity through a large portion of Wales, as well as in those countries which are now called Ireland and Scotland.⁵ Before Columba left his native country, he founded a monastery there, which, from the great number of oaks near it, was called Dearm-ach—the field of oaks. He came into North Britain about A.D. 565, and preached Christianity to the Picts, converting many of them. Their king, Bridius, gave him the island of Hy, or Iona, off the coast of Argyleshire, in which he founded a monastery, and from this and the monastery

¹ Rees, p. 215.

² Rees, pp. 197, 217.

³ Rees's *Welsh Saints*, p. 266. Camden, vol. ii., p. 812.

⁴ Collier, vol. i., p. 139.

⁵ Russell's *History of the Church in Scotland*, vol. i., p. 37.

of Dearm-ach many others had their origin, both in Britain and Ireland, through the influence of his disciples.¹

The island of Hy may be considered the centre of Christianity amongst the Irish or Albanian Scots, as that of Lindisfarne was amongst the Anglo-Saxon Northumbrians in later days. The island was always ruled by an abbot in priest's orders; and this circumstance has been brought forward by some writers as an argument in favour of the presbyterian form of church government—an argument which would have astonished the many episcopal and other missionaries who went forth from Iona, who, while looking with reverence to the parent monastery, knew nothing of that equality of ministers which was introduced into Scotland many centuries afterwards. Columba owned the superiority of the episcopal office even within his own jurisdiction, and considered the office of a bishop necessary for ordaining to the ministry, and for consecrating and continuing the episcopal line; he had always a bishop residing in his monastery. Iona was the home of so many good and learned men that its name and founder have become celebrated in history. Bede says that Columba and his followers were careful that the apostolic faith should be preserved. The clergy of Ireland (the ancient Scotia) were indeed noted for their holiness and scholarship, and their country was called the country of saints. St. Columba died and was buried at his monastery of Iona about A.D. 597, at the age of 77.²

Cyndeyrn, or Kentigern, was a Strathclyde Briton. He was instructed by Servanus, an Irish saint, and so earned his esteem that he was called by him 'Mwyngu,' or 'amiable,' which later writers have turned into Saint Mungo, a name by which he is frequently known. He is said to have been abbot of a monastery which he founded at Glasgow, whence he sent out missionaries; and he also founded the bishopric of Glasgow; but disputes amongst his countrymen obliged him to retire into Wales, where he was kindly received by St. David. While there he established a religious society at Llanelwy (St. Asaph), in Flintshire. There was an intimate friendship between him and St. Columba. Kentigern was celebrated for his preaching, and made many converts to Christianity. Eventually he returned to Glasgow, where he died.³

Asaph, who received his education under Kentigern, was a person of noble birth, eminent for learning and piety combined with industry and care. Kentigern, being greatly pleased with his behaviour, gave him the government of his monastery at Llanelwy, and he was his successor in the bishopric of that place. Asaph wrote the life of Kentigern, as well as some other works. He frequently made the observation "that those who hindered the progress of God's word envied the happiness of mankind."

¹ Bede, b. iii., ch. iv.

² Collier, vol. i., p. 143. Haddan's *Remains*, edited by bishop Forbes, p. 266.

³ Rees's *Welsh Saints*, p. 261. Collier, vol. i., pp. 140, 141.

The time of his death is not exactly known, but it was towards the end of the century, and probably took place at Llanelwy, which has derived its name of St. Asaph from him.¹

Oudoceus, who succeeded Teilo as bishop of Llandaff, summoned a synod, at which he solemnly excommunicated Mouricus, prince of the country, for a murder he had committed. He held another synod for the purpose of inducing two princes to keep the peace towards each other, which they promised to observe; but very shortly afterwards they broke their word. One of the contending parties killed the other; but being struck with horror at his crime, he came to the bishop to make satisfaction for it. On this Oudoceus again called his abbots and clergy together to give sentence; they directed that the prince should give alms, fast, and pray, and pledge himself to govern with justice and mercy. There are several instances of censures of this kind in the old register of Llandaff; we mention these to shew the customs of the times.²

Gildas, the historian, who studied under Illtyd, where Pawl Hen was his fellow pupil, was a monk in the celebrated monastery of Bangor, and a person of piety and eloquence. He lived in this century, though the exact time is not agreed upon. In his "epistle" he reproves the British princes for their vices with extraordinary freedom, and censures the clergy, quoting the examples of Ignatius and Polycarp for their imitation.³ Gildas was a native of North Britain, and wrote his *History of the Britons* at Glastonbury, where he remained to the close of his life.⁴

It was at the latter end of this century, after the last party of Saxons had spread themselves over the northern portion of the island, and those in the other divisions had settled themselves more completely in their new abode, that Theonus, bishop of London,⁵ and Thadiocus, bishop of York, were compelled to retire from the Saxon persecutions into Wales.

The invaders had now become too powerful for the Britons. They set up their own heathenism, destroyed the churches, and put a stop to Christian worship, as far as their dominion in Britain extended. The Church now lost ground almost everywhere, till it was visible only in Cornwall, Wales, and Cumbria, where the Britons still kept their footing.⁶

Armorica has been previously mentioned, and we may remind our readers that when the Romans left Britain many of the Britons left their country, and settled in that part of Gaul, forming a colony there. When the Franks became masters of the surrounding

¹ Collier, vol. i., p. 141. Rees, p. 265.

² Collier, vol. i., p. 139.

³ Collier, vol. i., p. 143.

⁴ Rees, p. 226.

⁵ The British name of London remains unchanged; it connects Teutonic England with the Celtic and Roman Britain of earlier times. Freeman, vol. i., p. 279.

⁶ Collier, vol. i., pp. 144, 145.

country, these settlers still remained a distinct people, though subject to the kings of France. They were governed by their own laws, and retained many of their own customs. There was a close connection between Armorica and Britain, the inhabitants passing from one to the other as their affairs required. The country was afterwards called Bretagne, and the inhabitants Bretons.

Sampson, bishop of York, the second of that name, went to Armorica, with several of the clergy and laity, about A.D. 522, where he was made archbishop of Dole, the principal bishop's see in that country. He had been a scholar of Ilutut, and was consecrated bishop by Dubricius.¹

¹ Collier, vol. i., p. 137.

CHAPTER VI.

CENTURIES VI. AND VII.

ARRIVAL OF AUGUSTINE. PROGRESS OF CHRISTIANITY AMONGST THE SAXONS.

GREGORY, bishop of Rome, surnamed the Great, was a learned and very able man. Before he became bishop, he saw one day in the market place at Rome some fair-haired light-complexioned youths, exposed for sale as slaves. He asked who they were, and if they were Christians. He was told they were pagans, and Angles from Britain. We must remind our readers that the Angles had settled in the north and middle of Britain, and one of the northern divisions was called Deira. "Ah," said Gregory, "they are angels in countenance, and co-heirs with angels they ought to be: where in Britain do their kindred dwell?" "In Deira," was the answer. "That is well," said Gregory, "it is our duty to deliver them from God's ire," in allusion to the similarity of that word to the latin for 'God' and 'ire,' or wrath. "Pray who is the king of the country?" "Ælla," was the reply. "Ah," exclaimed Gregory, "Hallelujah must be sung in that man's country."¹

Gregory went to the bishop of Rome, and begged him to send missionaries to Britain, offering to go himself; but nothing was then done. From that day he made up his mind to convert these pagans if it were possible; and when he afterwards became bishop of Rome, he did not forget this intention, but sent Augustine, a monk, and with him several others as missionaries into Britain.² They landed in Kent, where there was already a Christian princess and a bishop.

The Saxon kingdom of Kent had been established about 150 years. Ethelbert, who was king at this time, had married Bertha, daughter of Charibert, king of the Franks, who was grandson of Clovis. Charibert and his queen were Christians, and members of the Gallic Church: they would not allow their daughter to become the wife of Ethelbert unless he allowed her the free exercise of her religion. To this he agreed, and a Frankish bishop came with her into England.³ The ancient British church of St. Martin's, at Canterbury, which had been long unused, was repaired, and again made fit for the service of God.⁴ Those Britons who had remained amongst the Saxons when Theonus, bishop of London, had been driven from his post, gladly joined this little congregation.

King Ethelbert had become favourably disposed towards his wife's religion, and when he heard of Augustine's arrival, he went

¹ Bede, book ii., ch. i.

² Bede, book i., ch. xxiii.

³ Bede, book i., ch. xxv.

⁴ Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 40.

to see him. The result of the interview was that leave was given to the strangers to reside in Canterbury. Of their success in converting the people, there can be no doubt, as Ethelbert openly professed Christianity soon after the arrival of Augustine.¹

It must be observed that neither Gregory nor Augustine consulted with the British bishops and clergy, in order that they might work together in the common cause of Christianity; neither do we hear anything of the Frankish bishop who had come with queen Bertha into Kent, and into whose place Augustine appears to have stepped. We shall soon see that the latter required the Britons to acknowledge him as the head of their Church.

Augustine landed in Britain about A.D. 597, and was consecrated metropolitan or archbishop of Canterbury, at Gregory's desire, by the archbishop of Arles. Gregory also presented Augustine with a pall. This was a vestment or garment, which was part of the imperial dress, and the emperors gave the patriarchs leave to wear it.² When Anthimus, patriarch of Constantinople, was expelled from his see he returned the pall to the emperor Justinian. When Auxanius, archbishop of Arles, A.D. 543, desired the pall, the bishop of Rome did not bestow it till he had obtained the emperor's consent. The reason for this appears to be that the pall, being a royal habit, the emperor had the right to dispose of it, and it was not lawful to wear it without leave from the imperial court. As the power of the emperors decreased, the gift of the pall was gradually assumed by the bishops of Rome without reference to the sovereign. At first it denoted that the archbishops acted by authority of the Roman see, and finally, A.D. 1079, it was bestowed by Gregory VII., the celebrated Hildebrand, as a sign of their allegiance to him; the oath which was taken being expressed in the same language that a subject uses when swearing allegiance to his prince.³

Augustine applied to Gregory for advice on various points, some of which require notice here. He observed that as the liturgy of the Gallican and Roman churches differed in some respects, he wished to know which Gregory advised him to follow. Gregory replied that Augustine should choose that which would be most acceptable to Almighty God, and most suitable to the Church then new in the faith.⁴ This answer shows that Gregory was aware that the Christian churches differed in their services for divine worship, and did not think it reasonable that they should be obliged to conform to that practised at Rome.

There were other questions respecting the consecration of bishops, and how Augustine was to act towards the bishops of Gaul and Britain. Gregory informed him that he must obtain the assistance of his episcopal brethren in Gaul for consecration, as he was as yet

¹ Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 49.

² The bishops of Rome, Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople were styled 'patriarchs.'

³ Collier, vol. i., p. 161—165.

⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. i., p. 158. Bede, b. i., ch. xxvii.

the only bishop in Britain. He gave him no authority over the bishops in Gaul, as they were under the archbishop of Arles, adding, "Thou shalt not move a sickle into the standing corn of thy neighbour"—"thou mayest not apply the sickle of judgment in that harvest which seems to have been committed to another." With regard to the bishops of Britain, they were committed by Gregory to Augustine's care, that the unlearned might be taught, and the perverse corrected by authority.¹

We here see how entirely the ancient Church of these islands was overlooked. It was still shining in Wales and Ireland, and in the west of Scotland; and Augustine was by no means the only bishop in the island. Gregory, whilst careful for the independence of the Gallican Church, totally disregarded that of Britain, and treated the British bishops as schismatics on account of the difference of opinion with regard to Easter which will be presently noticed.

The mission of Saint Augustine prospered in Kent. He sent an account of his success and his miracles to Gregory, with a request for more labourers. It is plain, from Gregory's letter to Augustine, that he was a real believer in his miracles, as he tells him "to rejoice with fear"—to rejoice because these souls are by outward miracles drawn to inward grace, but to fear lest the weak mind be puffed up in its own presumption. Gregory sent Mellitus, Paulinus, and others to Augustine, together with church furniture and books, and relics of apostles and martyrs.² Such things as had belonged to or were supposed to be in any way connected with the apostles and the holy martyrs of the Church were highly valued, and the reverence for relics had become very general. It may easily be imagined that those who lived so near to the time in which these holy men had trod this earth, valued and treasured anything which could be supposed to have belonged to them, and which could bring the remembrance of their good deeds more vividly to their minds. But this custom unhappily became a source of superstition, until the number of the relics and the value set upon them were truly marvellous.

We are too apt to judge the Church of the first few centuries by the light of our own day. We forget the amount of ignorance, prejudice, and superstition that still surrounds us, notwithstanding our superior opportunities of knowledge. It is true that Christianity was carried to the pagan tribes which over-ran Europe, but education was confined to the few, and the uneducated always delight in the marvellous.

How far conversions were due to real miracles attending the ministry of these early preachers and missionaries, is a matter very difficult to determine. For though we are persuaded that those pious men who spread the light of Christianity amongst the barbarous nations in the midst of so many dangers, and in the face of

¹ Bede, book i., ch. xxvii.

² Bede, book i., ch. xxix. and xxxi.

such difficulties as seemed a complete barrier to their work, were blessed with the peculiar presence of the Most High; yet a greater part of the wonders related are liable to strong suspicion of falsehood or imposture. At the same time the following causes must be taken into account in charging the missionaries and writers of those ages with "pious frauds" or impostures. The ignorant whom they were instructing were disposed to look upon everything as a miracle that had an unusual appearance; and the missionaries of this and the preceding ages were so unacquainted with the laws of nature that they set down as miraculous such events as could now be easily explained.¹

Three or four years after the arrival of Augustine, a conference took place between him and the British bishops, by the assistance of Ethelbert, king of Kent. It is supposed to have been held on the confines of Wales, probably within the county of Worcester,² under a large oak, known long afterwards as St. Augustine's oak. Here they met twice. At the first meeting Augustine required the bishops to give up all forms and customs in their church, which differed from those of Rome and other churches in Christendom. They replied that they could not depart from them without the consent of their people.³ A second conference was therefore appointed, at which more of their number would be present. Seven British bishops attended on this occasion, together with many of their learned men, particularly those from their noble monastery of Bangor-is-y-Coed, over which the abbot Dinorth presided.

This conference appears to have been less friendly than the first. Augustine did not rise from his seat to greet his British brethren on their arrival. He asked three things of them—that they should keep Easter at the same time and baptize in the same manner as the Roman Church, and that they should help to preach to the Saxons, adding, "We will tolerate all the other things that you do, though contrary to our customs."⁴

Dinorth shewed Augustine that their bishops had always been independent; that the British churches owed brotherly kindness and charity to the Church of God, to the bishop of Rome, and to all Christians; but other obedience they knew not, "neither would they serve him as their archbishop;" for they said among themselves "if he would not now rise up to us, how much more will he condemn us as of no worth, if we shall begin to be under his subjection?"⁵

The mode of calculating the festival of Easter in the British Church, to which Augustine alluded, was quite different to that practised amongst other European churches at the time of his mission. It is unnecessary in these pages to point out in what the difference consisted. Its existence has been considered a proof

¹ Mosheim, vol. i., pp. 326, 476.

² Soames, ch. i., p. 55.

³ Bede, b. ii., ch. ii.

⁴ Bede, book ii., ch. ii.

⁵ Collier, vol. i., p. 178. Bede, book ii., ch. ii.

of the connection of the British Church with Asia, the cradle of our holy faith.¹ Some later writers have taken another view of the subject and assert that the oriental origin claimed for the Church of these islands is erroneous, and that the light of the gospel was spread from Gaul to Britain.² The Easter question remained a subject of sharp dispute between the churches of Britain and Rome for some time after the death of Augustine and Gregory.

Augustine being disappointed in this synod appears to have lost his temper. He told the British bishops "if they would not have peace with the brethren, they should have war with the enemy, and if they refused to afford them the word of life, they should have death in revenge."³ Thus ended this memorable conference, in which the most reasonable demand made by Augustine to the Britons was that they should join him in preaching the gospel to the Saxons.

The only excuse we can make for their not doing this was the peremptory demand of Augustine that they should change the ancient customs of their Church, and in that way submit themselves to him. By thus interfering with and attempting to exercise authority over the provinces of other bishops, Augustine set at nought the law of the Church universal, "that one bishop should not invade another's province;"⁴ and Gregory, by giving him authority to do so, acted inconsistently with his own words, "Thou mayest not apply the sickle of judgment in that harvest which seems to have been committed to another."

As seven bishops are mentioned as being present at this synod, it is not unlikely that the British bishops of York and London were there, as we know that they fled into Wales not long before the arrival of Augustine, and we only hear of five bishops' sees in Wales; namely, Bangor, St. Asaph, St. David's, Llandaff, and Llanbadarn Fawr. The last-named bishopric was afterwards united to St. David's.

No long interval had elapsed after this meeting of the British bishops with Augustine when Ethelfrid, the Anglian prince of Northumbria, savagely slaughtered about 1200 monks of the monastery of Bangor-is-y-Coed. He had made war on the inhabitants of North Wales, and gained a victory, and afterwards, seeing a large body of unarmed men, he asked who they were, and what they were doing. He was told they were monks, brought from their monastery at Bangor to pray for the success of their countrymen. Ethelfrid considered they were as much his enemies as those who had fought against him, and ordered them to be slain;⁵ and when Bangor fell into his hands, the noble college (or monastery) was levelled to the ground, its library was burnt, and nothing but

¹ Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 56.

² See *Remains of the late Rev. Arthur Haddan*, edited by bishop Forbes of Brechin, p. 211—238.

³ Collier, vol. i., p. 180.

⁴ Stillingfleet, ch. iii., p. 106.

⁵ Bede, b. ii., ch. ii.

a mass of ruins remained. In this library, which is mentioned as a large one, were deposited many precious records of the Britons.¹

This cruel outrage incensed the Britons to a high degree. They believed it to have been caused by Augustine; but his character and conduct were such that we cannot suppose he in any way suggested or authorized the slaughter of unarmed men and brother clergy.

We have stated that Augustine wrote to Gregory respecting the difference between the offices of divine worship used in the Roman and the Gallican churches. Saint Germanus brought the Gallican liturgy into Britain, and a short account of it may be interesting. The morning service commenced as our own may be said to do now with confession of sin. It chiefly consisted of lessons from the Old and New Testaments, of hymns, and of psalms from St. Jerome's translation. The Gloria Patri was repeated at the end of every psalm, as is still done in our church service. In the communion office there were various lessons, psalms, anthems, prayers, and thanksgivings, also the epistle and gospel, and after the latter came the sermon. The Athanasian Creed is believed to have been first used in divine service in the Gallican Church.²

The church music in the services of Rome was thought to excel that of all other western churches,³ and was chiefly the cause of the Romish services superseding other forms. This shows that music should not be neglected in our churches; it is a talent which should be employed in God's service; for in this case we see that the neglect or absence of it eventually occasioned the people to prefer the less pure but more attractive service of Rome.

Ethelbert, king of Kent, built a church in London, and dedicated it to St. Paul. This, being improved and rebuilt at different times, grew into our stately cathedral of St. Paul's. He also founded a church at Rochester, and made it a bishop's see. Augustine consecrated Justus, one of his band of missionaries, as its first bishop.⁴ Mellitus was consecrated bishop of London.⁵

In the year 604 death removed Saint Augustine, but not before he had consecrated as his successor Laurentius, another of his fellow labourers. Though we may justly feel displeased with Augustine for his haughty and domineering behaviour to the bishops of our Church, we must acknowledge that he minded neither danger nor discouragement, and that "he engaged in a glorious undertaking." He met with great success in Kent, and amongst the east Saxons, and the spread of Christianity in those parts was a step towards the conversion of the rest.⁶ Though Augustine was but a pioneer in the work of the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons, he justly merits the gratitude of Englishmen, and

¹ Sharon Turner, vol. i., p. 320.

² Collier, vol. i., p. 113—116.

³ Stillingfleet, ch. iv., p. 237.

⁴ Camden, pp. 231, 375.

⁵ *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.

⁶ Collier, vol. i., p. 183.

posterity may well excuse in him something of human vanity and indiscretion.¹

We mentioned in our last chapter that the Ostrogoths had obtained a kingdom in Italy, of which Ravenna was the capital. This kingdom lasted sixty years. They were expelled by Narses, the general of the eastern emperor Justinian, about A.D. 553. Ravenna, with the surrounding territories, commonly called the Roman dukedom, was then placed under the control of a magistrate, called an exarch, sent by the emperors from Constantinople, the first and the most powerful being Narses. The Roman dukedom was still nominally under the eastern emperor in the time of Gregory the Great, but new invaders harassed the peace of Italy. These were the Lombards, of whom Gregory was in constant fear. He wrote to the neighbouring bishops to supplicate God in litanies, and exhorted them to draw their people to prayer, and to preach to them the doctrine of repentance.

Gregory the Great died A.D. 604. It is impossible for any impartial person who has studied the character and conduct of Gregory as exhibited in his pastoral memoirs not to feel convinced of his piety and humility. His anxiety for the spread of true religion and the improvement of the clergy may be seen in his writings. He shewed an uneasy jealousy of John, bishop of Constantinople, upon whom the title of universal bishop had been conferred in an eastern council, a proceeding the more vexatious to Gregory because that honour, having first been offered by the synod of Chalcedon to the Roman bishops, had been declined by them. In his letters Gregory called himself the servant of the servants of God, which continues to this day to be the title of his successors, and is extremely inconsistent with the arrogance of the popes,² who have assumed to themselves not only the title of universal bishop, but that of vicar of Christ, and infallible head of the Church.

It is related that when one of the Italian bishops was boasting to Gregory of the good he had done, the latter told him he rejoiced to hear of his works of mercy, but he was sorry to find he had spoken of them to so many persons, and warned him not to spoil the whole of his deeds by this error. "What are we, dust and ashes," said Gregory, "that we should covet the praise of men?"³

The belief that the Roman bishop was the successor of St. Peter, which was now prevalent in Europe, was strengthened by the piety and virtues of Gregory, and his great reputation increased still more the power of his successors. He was a bright light in a troubled time, and behind none in any age in giving himself up to the service of God and the benefit of his fellow creatures.⁴

The successors of Augustine did not progress as well as might have been expected in their endeavours to spread Christianity. Many of the converts fell back into idolatry. Laurentius succeeded

¹ Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, ch. i., p. 60.

² Milner, p. 400—406.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 401.

⁴ Milner, p. 414.

Augustine as archbishop of Canterbury, and imitated his example in striving to make the members of the native churches abandon the forms in which they differed from Rome. Laurentius, with Mellitus and Justus, bishops of London and Rochester, wrote letters to the prelates of Scotia¹ to this effect. "To our dear brethren, the lords, bishops, and abbots throughout all Scotia. We held both the Britons and Scots in all sanctity, believing they followed the customs of the universal Church. We became acquainted with the errors of the Britons. We thought the Scots had been better, but have been informed through one of their bishops who came into Britain, and the abbot Columbanus, in France, that the Scots in no way differ from the Britons in their behaviour."²

Laurentius also wrote a letter to the inferior native clergy in Britain; but neither with them nor the Scots did he meet with the success he expected. In doctrine the churches were agreed; but the British Christians clung with fond affection to the customs of their national Church. Gregory's mission seemed on the point of failure. The son of Ethelbert, who had succeeded him in Kent, openly returned to paganism. Mellitus was expelled from the see of London by the pagan sons of the king of the east Saxons. Their father had been converted to Christianity, and had placed Mellitus in that see.

The three bishops consulted together, and agreed that it was better to return to their own country than remain amongst these semi-barbarians who had revolted from the faith.³ The bishops of London and Rochester left, but Laurentius determined to make one more effort, and this proved of more avail than argument. He appeared before the king, after spending the night in his church at Canterbury, and uncovering his shoulders, said, "I come to show you what I have undergone during the night. St. Peter stood at my side while I slept, reproached me sharply for presuming to flee from my charge, and scourged me severely, as these marks will testify." The pagan king, terrified at the sight, and perhaps fearful of a similar visitation if he persisted in his present course of life, gave up his gods, professed the Christian religion, and was baptized. Mellitus and Justus were recalled; the latter returned to his bishopric at Rochester, but Mellitus failed to be reinstated in London.⁴

Edwin, king of Northumbria, wished to marry a sister of the king of Kent, but the latter consented to the alliance on condition only that she should be allowed the free exercise of her religion, as her mother Bertha had been when she became the wife of Ethelbert. To this Edwin agreed, and the princess was accompanied by Paulinus, one of Gregory's band of missionaries, who was consecrated, A.D. 625, to the episcopal office by Justus, who had

¹ It will be remembered that this was then the name of Ireland.

² Bede, b. ii., ch. iv.

³ Bede, b. ii., ch. iv. and v. Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, pp. 56, 60.

⁴ Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 61.

now become archbishop of Canterbury. The efforts of Paulinus to convert the king were for some time unsuccessful, but at length the royal heart was touched. We take the following narrative of Edwin's early years from Bede. Ethelfrid (who had destroyed the monks of Bangor) reigned in Bernicia, and, taking possession of Deira, expelled the youthful prince, Edwin, who was conveyed into North Wales, where he was kindly treated by its prince, Cadvan. When circumstances compelled Edwin to leave Wales, he took refuge with the king of East Anglia, to whom Ethelfrid offered a large sum of money if he would deliver his rival into his hands. The young prince was fully aware of his dangerous position, and one night when brooding over his misfortunes, he saw a person approach whose face and dress were strange to him, and who, after some conversation, asked him what he would give to the man who should deliver him from this great distress. Edwin replied that he would give all that was in his power for such a favour. The stranger assured him that he should overcome his difficulties, and become a powerful prince, adding, "If he who foretells this can also give you better advice for your life and salvation than any of your kindred ever heard of, do you consent to follow his counsel?" Edwin did not hesitate to promise this, and the mysterious stranger then laid his hand on the head of the prince, saying, "When this sign shall be given you remember this discourse, and do not delay the performance of what you now promise." After uttering these words he vanished, by which circumstance the prince concluded it was not a man, but a spirit that had appeared to him. Soon afterwards Edwin found that the east Anglian king had been induced, by the advice of his queen, not only to refuse the request made by Ethelfrid, but to assist the royal wanderer to regain his kingdom. His protector then collected his forces and defeated Ethelfrid, who was slain; and thus, according to the words of the stranger, Edwin not only escaped from the hands of his enemy, but by his death succeeded him in the throne of Northumbria, both provinces being united under him. The sons of Ethelfrid fled, and found an asylum amongst the Irish, or Albanian Scots, where they became Christians.

Edwin, as we have related, delayed to receive the Christian faith from Paulinus, though he is said to have become doubtful as to what he should do. On one occasion, when he was sitting alone and pondering over the matter, Paulinus approached, laid his right hand on the head of the king, and asked "whether he knew that sign?" Edwin trembled, and, remembering the vision, was ready to fall at the feet of his teacher, who thus addressed him: "By the help of God you have escaped the hands of your enemies, and obtained your kingdom; take heed not to delay your promise." The king, after conferring with some of his principal counsellors, was baptized; and Paulinus, receiving permission to preach the gospel publicly, was so successful in converting those who heard him, that the chief priest, Coifi, became foremost in destroying the altars and temples of the idols. The multitude saw him with

amazement mounted and riding with speed to their principal temple, which he caused to be burned. "This place," says Bede, "is not far from York, and is called Godmundingham," now Goodmanhum, in the East Riding.¹

Edwin was baptized on Easter day, 627, in the church at York, which he built of timber whilst he was preparing for the sacred rite; and in this city he appointed the see of his instructor and bishop, Paulinus. After his baptism he began a larger building of free-stone for the cathedral, which was finished by his successor. Edwin was very prosperous, and zealous for the progress of Christianity; but, after a reign of seventeen years, he was attacked by Penda, the heathen king of Mercia, who was joined by Cadwallon, the son of Edwin's early friend and protector, Cadvan. These two princes defeated the king of Northumbria, whose army was cut to pieces and himself slain.

This was a great blow to the nation and Church of Northumbria. Christianity had spread much during the six years of Paulinus's stay. He, with Edwin's widowed queen, now returned into Kent, and the see of Rochester being vacant, Paulinus was appointed to it, and retained it till his death. The victors ravaged Northumbria, the British prince, Cadwallon, though professing Christianity, joining the heathen Penda in these excesses, imagining that the time had arrived when he should drive out the hated Saxon. Of two of the princes who claimed Northumbria, one was killed by Cadwallon when he came with a few followers to sue for peace,² the other fell in battle. Both had relapsed into paganism, and the country returned to its former idolatry. Oswald, son of Ethelfrid, who had taken refuge amongst the Irish Scots, returned to Northumbria, where he rallied his people, and attempted to deliver them from Cadwallon's grasp. The haughty chieftain despised young Oswald; but he, with humble confidence, committed his cause to God. He caused a cross to be made, an emblem of his faith in Christ, and, raising his voice, called upon his followers, saying, "Let us all kneel and jointly beseech the true and living God Almighty in his mercy to defend us from the haughty and fierce enemy." All did as he commanded, and with the dawn of day they attacked their enemies, and gained a complete victory. Cadwallon and the flower of his army were destroyed, and the recovery by the Cymry of their ancient country never again became probable.³ The bard Llywarch Hen composed, in his old age, an elegy on Cadwallon, though his character was very undeserving of praise or admiration. The British bards, however, always commended those chieftains who combated most fiercely the hated Saxon.

"Fourteen great battles he fought
For Britain, the most beautiful;—
Of Lloegyr [England] the scourge and the oppressor.

¹ Bede, b. ii., ch. ix., xii., xiii.

² Warrington's *History of Wales*, p. 91. Bede, b. ii., ch. xx. Sharon Turner, vol. i., p. 349.

³ Sharon Turner, vol. i., p. 352. Bede, b. iii., ch. ii.

His hand was open ; honour flowed from it,
 As the water flows from the fountain :
 So will our sorrow through the lingering day,
 For Cadwallon !"¹

Cadwaladr, the son of Cadwallon, was the last of the Cambrian princes who assumed the name of chief sovereign of Britain, for it was but a name. He left his country in consequence of its disordered state, and went to Armorica (or Brittany).²

Oswald, who had become king of Northumbria, had been converted to Christianity by the Irish Scots, and brought up a member of our native Church. When he ascended the throne, he became anxious his people should be Christianized ; he therefore sent to his old friends in Iona for a bishop, by whose teaching and ministry his subjects might receive instruction in the Christian faith. The first who arrived, being of rather a rough temper, was disliked, and made no impression on the people ; so he returned, and complained that they were bigoted to paganism, and it was impossible to do them any good. Upon this Aidan, who was a man noted for his piety, and is supposed to have been a pupil of St. David, said he had probably not considered their weakness and want of knowledge ; that he did not follow the apostle's advice, and feed them with milk at first ; that he did not begin with plain truths, and so advance by degrees. This speech was much approved by the synod, and they decided that Aidan deserved the honour of being consecrated a bishop, and that none was better qualified than himself for the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons. He was, therefore, consecrated and dispatched on his mission.³

Bishop Aidan was a bright example of godliness ; he laboured to convert the pagan and to strengthen the faithful. Nor was king Oswald inferior to him. Uncorrupt and humble in the midst of prosperity, he encouraged every attempt to spread the knowledge and practice of true religion amongst his people.⁴ He willingly listened to Aidan's advice and instruction ; and when the bishop, who was at first not skilled in the Anglo-Saxon tongue, preached the gospel, this zealous and good prince interpreted his words to his chief men and ministers. Aidan fixed his bishop's see in the island of Lindisfarne, since called Holy Island, in honour of this good man. It is situated off the coast of Northumberland, and is at low tide connected with the mainland.⁵ From that time many missionaries from Columba's island of Iona came into Britain, and preached with great devotion. Churches were built in several places, the people flocked together to hear the word, and money and lands for monasteries were given by the king's bounty.

The monastery of Iona, from which Aidan came, was the chief of

¹ Sharon Turner, vol. i., p. 353.

² Warrington's *History of Wales*, b. iii., p. 93.

³ Collier, vol. i., p. 203.

⁴ Milner, p. 421.

⁵ Bede, b. iii., ch. iii.

those communities amongst the Scots and Picts, and had authority over all the others. One reason why such institutions became multiplied may be found in the state of the country, the largest part of which was either uncultivated or forest; and the pagan inhabitants were not likely to look with favourable eyes on their Christian fellow countrymen. Thus there was safety, as well as comfort, in and around the monasteries; there they could worship God without hindrance, they could cultivate their land in peace, their numbers were a protection, and when they travelled they could do so together if necessary for safety.

The practice and behaviour of Aidan was admirable. He lived up to the doctrines he preached, and was an example to both rich and poor. He tried to do some good to all whom he met; if pagans, he instructed them in the principles of Christianity; if Christians, he confirmed them in their faith, and pressed them to shew it in their practice. When travelling from place to place, he took care that those who accompanied him, whether clergy or laity, should spend some time in the study of the Scriptures.¹ When the rich gave him money, he bestowed it on the poor or used it to ransom those who had been unlawfully sold as slaves. Many of these became his scholars, and, after having taught and instructed them, he ordained them as priests in the Church. He was careful to omit nothing which he found in the apostolical and prophetic writings, but endeavoured to the utmost of his power to perform them all.²

Oswald's kingdom was larger than that of any of his ancestors, and he was called *bretwalda*, which, as we have seen in a previous chapter, implied a supremacy over the other princes. But in the height of his power Oswald always continued humble, affable, and generous to the poor and to strangers. After a prosperous reign of nine years he was killed in battle, about the year 635, when fighting for his country against Penda, king of the Mercians, in the thirty-eighth year of his age. He was succeeded by his brother Oswy.³

When death called Aidan from his labours, Finan succeeded him, and afterwards Colman. They were, like Aidan, Irish Scots from Iona, and members of the Celtic Church of these islands. Finan built a church in the island of Lindisfarne, which, after the manner of the Scots, he made not of stone but of oak, and covered with reeds. The custom of fasting on Wednesdays and Fridays was begun in the English church about this time. Many religious men and women followed the example of Aidan in fasting on those days.⁴ The Saxon homilies (or short sermons) exhorted the people to the frequent reading of the Scriptures, as the way to remind them of their greatest concerns, saying, "that as a blind

¹ Collier, vol. i., p. 205.

² Bede, b. iii., ch. v. and xvii.

³ Bede, b. iii., ch. vi. and ix.

⁴ Bede, b. iii., ch. v. and xxv.

man often stumbled in his motions, so those who are unacquainted with the word of God are apt to make false steps and miscarry.”¹

The kingdom of Mercia received the truth about A.D. 653. Peada, the son of Penda, king of Mercia, who had joined Cadwallon in his cruel attack on Northumbria, asked Oswy for his daughter Elflæda in marriage, but that king would not consent to her union with a pagan. Peada had come to visit Oswy, and when he heard the blessed promises of the gospel, he declared he would willingly become a Christian even though Oswy should still refuse to bestow on him the hand of the princess. He was much influenced in this decision by the king's son, Alfrid, who was his friend. Peada was accordingly baptized by bishop Finan, together with his earls and soldiers, and the servants who attended him. When he returned to his kingdom of Mercia, four priests were sent with him to instruct and convert his people, one of whom, Diuma, an Irish Scot, was consecrated bishop by Finan. Diuma and his companions were very successful. Nobles and peasants listened to their preaching, and numbers gave up their false gods, and were baptized.² Thus the whole centre of England was converted to Christianity by members of the Celtic churches.

The kingdom of East Anglia embraced Christianity about A.D. 635. Its prince, Sigebert, had been converted in France before he came to the throne, and being desirous that his people should gain a similar blessing, he obtained the assistance of a bishop, who came to him from Kent, and established a school for the instruction of youth. Sigebert resigned his crown, retired from the world, and became a monk in a monastery which he had built;³ thus abandoning the station in which he had been placed, and giving example to a practice which soon afterwards became largely spread, and which led to many inconveniences. East Anglia was but slightly indebted to the native clergy for its conversion.

The kingdom of Essex, or the east Saxons, however, owed much to their influence. Mellitus, who was one of Augustine's band of missionaries, had been expelled, and the country had sunk into unheeded heathenism until about A.D. 653, when the king of Essex was converted. He was a friend of Oswy, king of Northumbria, and often visited him. That prince tried to persuade him that his gods were no gods, being made by the hands of man; that the true God was invisible to our eyes; that he was the Creator, and would be the judge, of all men; that his abode was in heaven, not in vile wood and stone. The conversation of Oswy had a great effect, and the king of Essex was baptized by bishop Finan. He requested Oswy to give him some missionaries who might convert his people to the true faith; and accordingly two were sent, who travelled through the country and preached with much success. One of them, whose name was Cedd, returned to Northumbria to consult bishop

¹ Collier, vol. i., p. 206.

² Bede, b. iii., ch. xxi.

³ Bede, b. iii., ch. xviii.

Finan on some points. Finan consecrated Cedd to be bishop of the Church amongst the east Saxons, and he returned to his post, where he built churches, and ordained priests and deacons to assist him.

The west Saxons, or the people of Wessex, were chiefly converted by Birinus, a Roman monk, whom Honorius, bishop of Rome, sent to Britain. He was greatly indebted for his success amongst the people to Oswald, king of Northumbria, who visited the west Saxon court. Birinus on his death was succeeded as bishop by Agilbert, a Frenchman by birth, who had lived a long time in Ireland for the purpose of religious study, and had come as missionary amongst the west Saxons by desire of Oswy, king of Northumbria.¹

The king of the south Saxons, the people of Sussex, visited the king of Mercia, after that part of the country had been converted, and he there became a Christian, and was baptized. His people, however, were chiefly influenced to Christianity by Wilfrid, who was a zealous follower of Roman customs, though an Anglo-Saxon, and of whom we shall soon hear further.²

Oswald, of Northumbria, and the other good men we have named, deserve to be remembered with feelings of especial gratitude. The Christian work of these members of our Celtic Church has been too little thought of, while that of Augustine has been unduly magnified, for we have shewn on good authority how much was done by them amongst the Anglo-Saxons. Every county of England, north of the Thames and south of the Clyde and Forth, excepting Norfolk and Suffolk, can point to them as their instructors in Christ's holy faith.³

It does not appear that the Welsh assisted their brethren in preaching to the Anglo-Saxons. They had undoubtedly great cause for irritation and anger against that people; and the massacre of the monks of Bangor, with the war between Cadwallon and the inhabitants of Northumbria, must have added to the bitterness of their feelings. The haughty behaviour of Augustine and his arrogant pretensions to be supreme head of their Church, must also be taken into account; and when all these things are considered, we feel that we must not condemn the Welsh too severely for their neglect of the sacred duty of Christianizing their neighbours. The feelings of anger which those Britons who had fled into Wales felt for their Saxon conquerors were kept up and increased by their chiefs and bards. From this time the history of the Church of these islands is chiefly related by Anglo-Saxon writers, and we shall only hear occasionally of its progress in Wales.

The colony of Irish or Albanian Scots does not appear to have suffered from the ravages of the Saxons, and the monastery of Iona was too remote to be disturbed by them.

¹ Bede, b. iii., ch. vii. and xxii. Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 70.

² Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 71.

³ Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 69. Haddan's *Remains*, pp. 266, 267.

CHAPTER VII.

CENTURIES VII. AND VIII.

THE EASTER QUESTION. THE VENERABLE BEDE. CHURCH AND STATE.

Oswy, king of Northumbria, married the widow of Edwin, who had been obliged to flee into Kent with Paulinus. She preferred the usages of the Church of Rome, which had been adopted in Kent, to those of the British churches, which were followed by Oswy and his people. The time of keeping Easter was a subject respecting which many arguments arose about the middle of this century. It will be remembered that this was a point much insisted upon by Augustine in his conferences with the British bishops, and he brought the Roman time of keeping Easter into Kent.

The Northumbrian bishops Aidan and Finan had gone to their rest. Their place was filled by the Irish or Albanian Scot, Colman, who was a good man, but does not appear to have possessed the influence of his predecessors. Wilfrid, who was a friend of the queen of Northumbria, and had educated the young prince Alfrid, her son, was an Anglo-Saxon, a learned man, who had travelled in France and Italy, and studied in Rome.

Wilfrid used his best endeavours to make the Roman mode of keeping Easter that of the Anglo-Saxon churches. It was at length agreed that a conference should be held in the monastery over which the abbess Hilda presided, at a place which has since been called Whitby. At this were assembled the abbess Hilda, the venerable bishop Cedd of the east Saxons, together with bishop Colman and his clergy. The Roman view of the question was supported by prince Alfrid, Wilfrid, his friend Agilbert, bishop of the west Saxons, and those who came from Kent with the queen. King Oswy said that those who worshipped the one true God, and looked for the same kingdom of heaven, ought to observe the same rules; therefore they should inquire which was the truest tradition, that the same might be followed by all. He then desired bishop Colman to declare what the custom was which he followed as to Easter, and from whence it derived its origin.

Colman replied that he received it from his elders; that their forefathers, men beloved of God, kept it in like manner, and that it ought not to be rejected, as it was the same which the beloved apostle St. John is recorded to have observed, together with all the churches over which he presided.

Wilfrid, who was spokesman on the opposite side, said, amongst other things, that throughout the Christian church Easter was observed at the same time as at Rome, at which place the blessed apostles Peter and Paul had taught, suffered death, and were buried. He concluded by asking Colman if he thought, though

his fathers were holy men, that the opinion of their small number in the remotest island was to be preferred before that of the universal Church¹ throughout the world.

As Wilfrid's argument appeared the strongest, it prevailed, and the conference was closed. Colman, finding the ancient practice of the Church was overruled, went back to Iona, A.D. 664, to consult his brethren, and afterwards retired to Ireland.² He never returned to Northumbria, and was succeeded in his bishopric by Tuda, who was also an Irish or Albanian Scot, and who lived but a short time. These Scots presided over the Northumbrian Church for upwards of thirty years, and deeply is our country indebted to them for the work they performed. Their whole care was to serve God, not the world: to feed the soul, not the body. They had no more worldly substance than was sufficient for their maintenance. For these reasons they were held in the highest veneration by the people; and wherever a monk or priest came, he was received as God's servant. They went about for no other purpose than to preach, baptize, and visit the sick.³

The controversy respecting the time of celebrating Easter did not interfere with any of the great doctrines of Christianity, and it had ended by the eighth century, in favour of the Roman method,⁴ throughout England, Wales, and Scotland.

The abbess Hilda presided at first over a monastery called Hereteu (now Hartlepool), and here king Oswy, in pursuance of a vow he had made, placed his daughter under her care. The occasion of his doing so arose in the following manner. He had been much harassed by Penda, king of the Mercians, and when he was preparing to fight against him with a much smaller force than that of his opponent, he made a vow that if victorious, he would dedicate his daughter to the Lord, and give twelve farms to build monasteries. Oswy gained the victory, returned thanks to God, and gave his daughter Elfleda, then scarcely a year old, to be consecrated to Him as a virgin. She was brought up by Hilda, who afterwards built another monastery at the place now called Whitby, in Yorkshire, of which she became the head.⁵ The ruins of a monastic establishment still exist at Whitby.

Wilfrid succeeded Tuda in the Northumbrian diocese, and went to Gaul to be consecrated by his friend Agilbert, who had become bishop of Paris. He was tempted to linger amidst the hospitalities of that city; and Oswy displeased at his delay, selected Chad, who was abbot of the monastery of Lastingham, to be bishop of the diocese of York, and he was accordingly consecrated to that see. Chad was brother to Cedd, bishop of the east Saxons, and, says Bede, "two other brothers were also priests of the Lord, which is a rare thing to be met with in one family." Bishop Chad had been

¹ Bede, b. iii., ch. xxv.

² Bede, b. iv., ch. iv.

³ Bede, b. iii., ch. xxvi.

⁴ Mosheim, vol. i., p. 454.

⁵ Bede, b. iii., ch. xxiv.

a pupil of the good bishop Aidan, and endeavoured to instruct the people according to his example.¹

The archbishop of Canterbury died about this time. The kings of Kent and Northumbria now thought of checking the religious dissension which existed, by sending a new primate to be consecrated at Rome. They fixed on Wighard, a native priest, who was kindly received at Rome, but died there shortly after his arrival. The bishops of Rome had been rising step by step in power and influence on the continent of Europe, and bishop Vitalian now thought to take advantage of this opportunity in order to gain authority in our island. He therefore determined to try if an archbishop nominated by himself would be accepted by the Anglo-Saxon Church; for he considered that such a prelate was likely to lean more to Roman usages, and to have a greater reverence for the see of Rome than one native born. His choice fell upon Theodore, a native of Asia Minor, A.D. 669; and the island princes, wearied by the long disputes, not only received Theodore as archbishop, but gave him that authority over the whole Anglo-Saxon Church which Augustine had coveted in vain.²

Theodore exerted himself for the extension of learning in his adopted country, and was greatly assisted therein by his friend Adrian, who accompanied him to Britain. Adrian was born in Africa, and had recommended Theodore to the bishop of Rome for the see of Canterbury. These two foreigners brought some valuable books into Britain, founded schools, and set themselves to enlighten and educate the people. It was to them that the Anglo-Saxons owed that eminence in learning over the other nations of Europe which they soon acquired. Their pupils spread abroad the knowledge they had received, and established schools in each monastery, not only for the clergy, but for the laity likewise. Their supply of books being insufficient, many journeys to Rome were undertaken to procure others from the collections in that city, and a library began to be the pride of every monastery.³

Sacred music was generally introduced during the lifetime of archbishop Theodore; its use having previously been confined to the kingdom of Kent. Theodore visited all parts of the country, ordained bishops where required, and with their assistance corrected whatever he found amiss. He urged everywhere an uniformity with Rome; doubtless, in reference to those points of dispute which had occurred before his arrival. He caused the liberty of the monks to be curtailed in so far that they should remain stationary in their several monasteries unless they obtained the abbot's leave for absence or removal.⁴

King Oswy died A.D. 670, soon after Theodore came to Britain. He was the last Anglo-Saxon prince who had the title of *bret-walda*, and was succeeded by his son Egfrid. Prince Alfrid, the

¹ Bede, b. iii., ch. xxiii. and xxviii.

² Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 78.

³ Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 79, and note in *ibid.*

⁴ Bede, b. iv., ch. iv. Soames, pp. 79, 274.

elder son, being rejected as illegitimate, retired into Ireland, where he devoted himself to piety and learning. There he enjoyed for fifteen years a life of retirement and study, and was said to be "most learned in the Scriptures."

Egfrid's queen, Etheldreda, had long requested him to let her retire to a monastery. He at length consented, and she became a nun. She built a religious house at Ely, where she received many young women who like herself wished to retire from the world. The present cathedral of Ely sprang from the monastery founded by Etheldreda more than twelve hundred years ago.

Egfrid lost his life in battle. He not only waged war against the Scots in Ireland, but fought also with the Picts; and it was in a battle against the latter that he perished, together with most of his troops. The body of the king was taken to Iona, the island of St. Columba, and there buried. Northumbria had hitherto been the strongest of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, and had menaced the others with subjection; but this fatal expedition of Egfrid greatly lessened its power.¹ The Picts and Scots now disowned its authority, and some of the British princes who had become subject to it obtained independence.

On the death of his brother, prince Alfrid was summoned from his studies and retirement in Ireland, to fill the throne of Northumbria, A.D. 684. His dominions, though much smaller than those of his father, were ruled with prudence; he again restored order, and was called "the wise king of the Saxons."

We must now give a slight account of the further career of bishop Wilfrid. He regained possession of the diocese of York, having represented bishop Chad to archbishop Theodore as an intruder there. Chad finally became bishop to the Mercians at Lichfield, where he devoted himself to his work, and where he died and was buried.² It is difficult to follow the events of Wilfrid's episcopate. His restless, turbulent spirit frequently brought him into trouble, first with king Egfrid, when he appealed to the Roman bishop Agatho, who supported his views; but the Anglo-Saxons would not attend to Roman interference. He afterwards occupied himself in evangelizing Sussex. At the close of archbishop Theodore's life, that prelate wrote in favour of Wilfrid to the Northumbrian court, and he was restored to his bishopric in that kingdom. His character did not shine in prosperity, and his haughty spirit caused him to be dismissed the country during the reign of Alfrid, who had called the bishops of the province together to consider the matter. Wilfrid carried his complaints to the bishop of Rome, who interfered in his behalf by writing a dictatorial letter to the Northumbrian king. He returned to Britain, and sent an abbot and one of his retinue to king Alfrid with the letter from Rome.³ The king's reply to them was so

¹ Bede, b. iv. ch. xix. Sharon Turner, vol. i., p. 373—375.

² Bede, b. iv., ch. iii. Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 79.

³ Collier, vol. i., p. 276.

spirited that we give it in his own words:—"My venerable brothers, ask of me whatever things are necessary to your own comfort, and I will grant them as proofs of my great respect for you; but from this day make no solicitations for Wilfrid, your lord. What my royal predecessor, and the archbishop sent formerly from Rome, with almost all the prelates of Britain, thought fit to order, I will never change while I live—whatever writings you may bring me from the apostolic seat, as you choose to call it." Alfrid adhered with firmness to his determination.¹

Wilfrid finally held the see of Hexham, and the abbey of Ripon, at which latter place he was buried. His zeal for Italian usages and calls for foreign interference have procured him a place amongst the Romish saints. He has been brought forward as an authority of high antiquity for appeals to Rome; but his history shews that they were treated with contempt, not only by the civil but also by the ecclesiastical authorities.²

Alfrid reigned for nineteen years, and his people were blessed by his wisdom and virtues. After his death, the decay of the Northumbrian kingdom was hastened by incessant usurpations and civil wars, and the flame of learning which he had kindled in his dominions was quenched. Its influence, however, was felt in the other provinces. One of Alfrid's successors, A.D. 731, was the person to whom Bede dedicated his ecclesiastical history of the English nation.³

We must not omit to mention John, who succeeded Wilfrid in the see of York. He is better known by the name of St. John of Beverley, and was a person of good parentage in Yorkshire, who received instruction from Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, and Hilda, abbess of Whitby. John was the tutor of the venerable Bede, and was first bishop of Hexham, from whence he removed to the see of York A.D. 705. While journeying through his diocese he came upon the pretty scenery of Inderawood, as Beverley was then called, with its little wooden church thatched with reeds, and resolved to found there a religious house. He endowed it with land, which example being followed by others, it became in course of time a large monastic establishment. In 718, John resigned the see of York, and retired to the congenial retirement of his beloved adopted Beverley. Here he died A.D. 721, and was buried in a church which was the predecessor of the present beautiful minster. His remains were afterwards enshrined in gold and jewels, but a fire in 1188 destroyed the church. The bones of St. John of Beverley were preserved in a case of lead, which was found in later years, and in 1736 they were placed under a square slab of black marble, which may be seen by those who now visit the noble minster church. In the historic west window of that structure he and other representatives of the early times

¹ Sharon Turner, vol. i., p. 379.

² Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 89.

³ Sharon Turner, vol. i., p. 377—379.

of Beverley are traced; but the holy life of this good bishop is his best memorial.¹

Archbishop Theodore held a synod at Hereford (supposed to be Hatfield, in Hertfordshire), for settling the affairs of the Church. The first canon decreed that the disputed point of Easter should be set at rest, and that the festival should be kept at the same time all over the country. Another rule was laid down respecting monks, who were desired not to move from their monasteries without the leave of their abbot. This was a change from the primitive custom of the British Church, by which their residence was not only voluntary, but they could come in and go out at pleasure. Other laws were passed for the regulation of bishops and priests. It was also set forth that more bishops should be made as the number of believers increased, but this matter was passed over for the present. It was at this synod that the confederation of the several dioceses under the archbishop of Canterbury as metropolitan, was agreed to; and thus the unity of the Church preceded the unity of the kingdom, for it was not till the ninth century that England became united under one ruler.

This archbishop seems to have planned a parochial clergy after the usage of his native Asia. Justinian, emperor of Constantinople, or the east, encouraged the erection of churches by allowing every person who built one to nominate the clergyman. Theodore followed this example in England, and here we can trace the origin of patronage in the Church. The owners of land were thus induced to supply the spiritual wants of their followers. The striking difference in the extent of parishes, and the inconvenient position of many of their churches, is due therefore, not to negligence, but to the unequal size of the estates on which they were built.²

Theodore died A.D. 690, at an advanced age, after an honourable and laborious life, the latter part of which was spent in the service of his adopted country. He must be ranked amongst her ablest primates, but he laid the foundation of that influence which Rome afterwards obtained in this country, and through which our Church lost her independence and the purity of her faith.

In our account of early British Christianity we noticed how many churches were founded by chieftains, or their near relatives. The names of these benefactors have been retained in some parts of Wales, but all traces of them have been swept away in England. We dwelt a little on the lives of some of those holy men, the founders and supporters of Britain's early Church; but those saints are comparatively unknown to fame. None but St. David and St. Carodoc have been admitted into the Romish calendar, for that Church has ever been unwilling to acknowledge the good deeds of those who did not allow her supremacy. By this word we mean

¹ *Ecclesiastical History of the Church of St. John of Beverley*, by the Rev. W. B. Crickmer, M.A.

² Bede, b. iv., ch. v. Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, vol. i., p. 85.

that authority which the bishops of Rome gradually claimed in all things spiritual, and which they professed to derive from the apostle St. Peter, of whom they claimed to be the successors.

Ireland, still known as Scotia, was not idle during this century. Her missionaries were in every land; and we can point to Switzerland, Holland, and Germany as witnesses to her labours; whilst the names of Fridolin the traveller, Gallus, Beatus, Killian, and Columbanus have come down to us as the honoured instruments for carrying God's truth from Scotia to those pagan tribes. Gallus laboured in Switzerland, and the town of St. Gall bears his name in honour of his memory.

Columbanus, the monk, was a noted missionary during the latter part of the last and early part of this century. He came into Britain, and afterwards went to Gaul, where he was very successful in converting the Franks. He remained in that country about twenty years, when he was banished by one of the princes whom he had reproved for his sins. He then retired into Italy, where he built the monastery of Bobio, near Naples.¹

Killian became an earnest missionary amongst the Germans. He had converted the pagan duke Gosbert, who was baptized with many others. This duke had married his brother's widow, for which Killian reproved him, and desired him to put her away. Gosbert promised to do so when he returned from an expedition in which he was engaged, but during his absence the widow revenged herself upon Killian by causing him and his companions to be murdered, which cruel act was carried out when they were engaged in their devotions. The duke allowed the murderess to escape justice, but the death of the devoted missionary was avenged, for all the actors in the crime, as well as the duke himself, came to an untimely end. It has been well said that "the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church"—and thus it proved to be in this case, for numbers of the people amongst whom Killian had laboured embraced Christianity, and a cathedral was erected in the next century on the spot where he had suffered martyrdom.

Towards the end of this century many Anglo-Saxons of noble birth, as well as those of lower rank, retired from Britain to Ireland for the sake of divine studies; some devoted themselves to a monastic life, others went about from one teacher to another applying themselves to learning. They were willingly received, and care was taken to supply them with food, as also to furnish them with books to read, and their teaching was free of charge.² Ireland was also noted for the literature of some of her monastic schools, and a well-known writer says that during the seventh, eighth, ninth, and part of the tenth centuries, "Ireland was the school of the west."

We have now shown our readers the progress of the Church in these islands from the introduction of Christianity to the close of

¹ Collier, vol. i., p. 144.

² Milner's *Church History*, p. 423. Bede, b. iii., ch. xxvii.

the seventh century. Its history will henceforth be more closely connected with the Anglo-Saxon sway.

After the death of archbishop Theodore, we find the Anglo-Saxons had made good use of the schools he had established, also of the advantages afforded to them in Ireland. They were more advanced in learning than other nations. Benedict Biscop was a noble Northumbrian, who travelled to Rome with the famous Wilfrid. When he returned to his native land he brought with him a considerable number of books and relics. He built two churches and founded two monasteries, one of which was at Wearmouth, the other at Jarrow, near the mouth of the Tyne, for which he had land granted to him by the Northumbrian king. Biscop also brought from Rome a person since known as John the precentor, whose office was to teach in Biscop's monasteries the method of singing practised at St. Peter's. John was especially directed by the bishop of Rome to make himself acquainted with the faith of the Anglo-Saxon Church, and to bring an account of it when he returned to Italy.¹

Aldhelm was the first Anglo-Saxon writer worthy of mention. He was educated by Adrian, the friend and companion of archbishop Theodore, and was the first of his countrymen who wrote or composed in latin. He became bishop of Sherborne, in Dorsetshire. He was deputed at a synod to write a treatise against the British method of keeping Easter, and accordingly wrote an epistle to Geruntius, or Geraint, king of West Walos, now Cornwall, which country was held by the Britons, and whence many had retired from other parts. In this epistle he also complains of their doing several things contrary to the peace of the Church. Aldhelm wrote other books, and was in all respects a very learned man.²

We now come to a name well known to readers of English church history—the venerable Bede. How or why that epithet was applied to him does not appear. He was born A.D. 674, on an estate which belonged to Benedict Biscop's monasteries, his first instructor being Biscop, who did not live to complete his education, but whose library was a treasure to his pupil. Archbishop Theodore and Adrian were living during his early years. His industry was great, which is evidenced by the catalogue of his works; every branch of knowledge that came within his reach was searched by him, but Scripture was his favourite study. He lived in the monastery of Jarrow, where he wrote his ecclesiastical history, the work which has immortalized his name. The books written in this century are full of superstitions, marvellous stories and miracles, and dwell much on the veneration of martyrs, saints, and relics. Bede shared in these errors, but when the chaff is sifted from the wheat a valuable work is left, and he is justly celebrated as the "father of English history." It was to Rome,

¹ Bede, b. iv., ch. xviii.

² Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 100. Bede, b. v., ch. xviii.

through his teacher Benedict Biscop, that Bede was indebted for education and a library, and he retained through life a strong partiality for Romish usages; yet, it is from his history we learn that the Anglo-Saxons were mostly converted to Christianity by missionaries from the native Church.¹

A year before his death Bede wrote a letter to his friend Egbert, archbishop of York,² which deserves to be remembered for its good sense. In this letter Bede told Egbert to apply himself to the study of the Holy Scriptures, especially the epistles to Timothy, where the duties of holy orders are set forth. He said it was indecent in him, who is dedicated to the service of the Church, to give way to actions or discourse unsuitable to his sacred character. He advised that priests or presbyters should be appointed in each village to instruct the people and administer the sacraments; and that the people should learn by heart the creed and Lord's prayer, in order that they might repeat them in their own tongue. Bede had translated these into Anglo-Saxon. He complained of the increase of monasteries, and said, "In truth there are many places having the name without deserving it."³

Bede was engaged in translating the gospel of St. John into the Anglo-Saxon tongue when he felt his end approaching. As the sun rose, he entreated his disciples to write quickly from his dictation. He was mournfully obeyed. At nine o'clock one alone remained with him, the rest having left to join the procession usual on Ascension-day. The young disciple said, "A single chapter still remains, dearest master; will it distress you if I ask you to go on with its translation?" "By no means," replied the dying scholar; "take your pen, but write quickly." As time thus wore away the venerable translator said, "There are a few trifles in my desk; bring them and call my brethren. Rich men's presents are gold and silver, or other costly things; mine must be recommended by the affectionate pleasure with which I give them." He was soon surrounded by a circle of weeping friends. "You will see my face no more," said Bede, "it is time that my spirit should return to God who gave it. My life has been long, and a gracious Providence has made it happy. I have a desire to depart and be with Christ." The youth, who had been copying, then exclaimed, "Dear master, one sentence has not even yet been written." Bede replied, "Make haste then, and write it." When this was done, the dying man said, "It is finished. Take my head and turn my face to the spot where I have been used to pray. Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost." His lips ceased to move, and his sorrowing friends saw that he had gone to his

¹ Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 100.

² The division of the Church into two provinces appears to have been planned by Gregory and Augustine, but the failure of the mission of Paulinus (see ch. vi.) probably prevented its accomplishment, and it was not till Egbert succeeded to the see of York that it was erected into an archbishopric. The archbishop of Canterbury made no opposition to the arrangement.

³ Milner's *Church History*, p. 432, from Bede's works, Paris edit., p. 46.

rest, and his spirit had returned to God who gave it. He died at the monastery of Jarrow, A.D. 735.¹

Egbert, who became archbishop of York A.D. 732, and who had been the friend and companion of Bode, was a scholar and an author. He was ordained deacon at Rome, whither he had travelled when quite young, according to the custom which then prevailed of visiting that city. When in after life he was chosen as archbishop, he was desired by the king of Northumbria to go to Rome for the pall. Our explanation of this vestment in a previous chapter will be remembered. The application for it was a mark of deference to the Roman see, which had not hitherto been shewn by any Anglo-Saxon. This archbishop was remarkable for his ecclesiastical learning, and for the encouragement which he gave to literature. He took an active part in tuition, and formed a library at York. It appears from some of his writings that progress had been made in the settlement of parochial clergy. Prayers for the dead were not yet an article of belief in the Anglo-Saxon Church.

During the early days of Christianity the civil power was generally heathen, and the moral code of their world was very different to that of the Christian. The penances or punishments which were enforced by the latter were, therefore, a wholesome medicine for the correction of offences of which the civil magistrate would take no account. It was the business of the bishops and clergy to look after the morals of their flocks. The smaller offences they punished by penance, the more flagrant sins by excommunication. This authority remained in the hands of the clergy after the princes had become Christians, and the civil power guided by Christian rules. Archbishop Egbert wrote in the latin and Anglo-Saxon languages a list of penances for particular sins, which was called his Penitential. This prelate presided over the see of York for thirty-four years, and was an example of the noble use of abilities and wealth.²

The Anglo-Saxons had from the earliest times an assemblage of their chief men, which was called the *witena-gemot*.³ It was summoned by the king, and was composed of the sovereign; the noble proprietors of land, called *eorls*, from whence is derived our title of earl; the gentry or thanes; the chief of the clergy who had landed property; the bishops and abbots. Thus the Anglo-Saxon witena-gemot very much resembled our parliament. Ina, king of the west Saxons, A.D. 696, in his introduction to his laws, mentions the various orders of the nation as assisting in their formation. He says, "My bishops and all ealdormen, and the eldest witan of my people, and a great collection of God's servants." Here the bishops, the nobles, the people, and the clergy are distinctly named. It will thus be seen that our bishops had a voice with the laity in

¹ Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 102.

² Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, pp. 105, 106.

³ Or meeting of the wise, the common title being simply the witan or wise men. Freeman, vol. i., p. 102.

this our earliest national council or parliament, whether for religious or other purposes.¹

The following are some of the regulations relating to the Church which were passed in the reign of Ina. The clergy were to live conformably to the customs and discipline of the Church. Every child was to be baptized within thirty days of its birth under penalty of a fine. Any person who laboured on Sunday was to be fined. If any one guilty of a crime worthy of death, took refuge in a church, his life was to be spared, and a fine only imposed. This was somewhat similar to the cities of refuge mentioned in the Old Testament; it was called privilege of sanctuary, and was liable to much abuse, though it sometimes acted as a protection to the weak against the oppression of the strong. The same custom prevailed amongst the Welsh. Church dues for the product of the land were to be paid wherever the person owing them had dwelt at the previous Christmas.²

Two years after these laws were passed by Ina, the king of Kent called together his witenagemot at Becanceld, near Sittingbourn, at which were present the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishop of Rochester, abbots, priests, and others of the clergy, with dukes, earls, and great men of the laity. The regulations made were drawn up in the king's name in the form of a charter, and related to the privileges of the Church. The king exempted the churches in his dominions from the payment of taxes. Sacrilege is spoken of with detestation, and the laity were forbidden to make any encroachment upon churches or abbeys. It was added that as it belonged to the king to dispose of posts of honour and trust in the civil government, so it belonged to the archbishop to govern the churches of God, and to elect and consecrate bishops, abbots, &c. This record was ordered to be laid up in the church at Canterbury for security.³

The requirements of public worship had been provided for by voluntary offerings on the altar. When the entire community had been converted to Christianity, such contributions became uncertain, and by the laws of Ina they were wisely changed for a regular assessment upon houses. Every dwelling was to be valued at Christmas, and the rate so imposed, called 'church-shot,' was payable at Martinmas following. If the church-shot was not paid, a fine was inflicted of forty shillings, and the rate was to be levied twelve fold. This care for the proper observance of public worship may be considered as the legal origin of church-rates, which our legislative assembly has lately abolished after an existence of nearly twelve hundred years. Thus earlier than almost any of England's written laws appears on record a legal provision for the due performance of the offices of religion.

Ina resigned his crown, as many Anglo-Saxon kings did at this

¹ Sharon Turner, vol. iii., b. viii., ch. iv.

² Collier, vol. i., p. 266.

³ Collier, vol. i., p. 267.

period. He travelled with his queen to Rome, where he retired from the world, and there ended his days. Before his death he founded a school at Rome for such of his countrymen as chose to be educated there, to which he added a church for their use. To support this he imposed the payment of one penny from every family in his dominions. This was called 'Rome-shot.'¹

Tithe is one of the most ancient payments known. We first hear of it in Scripture, when Abram paid tithes to Melchizedek, priest of the most high God. Gen. xiv. 18, 20. St. Paul refers to this, Heb. vii. 2, "To whom Abraham gave a tenth part of all." The Jews paid a tenth of the produce of their land to the Levites by the command of God. Lev. xxvii. 30; Num. xviii. 21, 24. We find from history that tithes were paid by heathen nations, and both the Greeks and Romans did so. The Saxons were accustomed to pay tithes to their pagan priests, and such payments seem to have been considered due to the ministers of religion, whether Jews or pagans, from the earliest times. During the first years of Christianity the Christians had all things in common, Acts ii. 44, 45, and sent contributions to each other. Romans xv. 26. But as Christ's religion spread abroad and churches were built, the richer members of the community bestowed gifts and lands for the support of the sacred buildings and of the clergy who ministered in them. When the pagan nations were converted, and the Christian Church became settled and established, it was unnecessary to make new laws on the subject; for as it had been customary to give the tenth for the service of their false gods, it would appear to them still more proper to bestow it for that of the true Lord of heaven and earth.² Perhaps the custom did not prevail amongst the Christians before the conversion of Constantine the Great, but by the end of the fourth century it was not uncommon. The British chieftain Cunedda Wledig, as we have previously mentioned, "gave lands to God"³ in the island of Britain towards the beginning of the fifth century. The Anglo-Saxons seem to have found the tenth part considered as God's portion amongst the British Christians.

When our early Anglo-Saxon proprietors founded a church they solemnly dedicated the tenth or tithes of their lands for its maintenance—apparently without any legal compulsion or any hesitation; but as from the covetousness of human nature men are apt to endeavour to evade any charges upon their estates, the Anglo-Saxon legislature had to interfere on different occasions, and penalties were enacted, so that every landed proprietor should be compelled to discharge the claim to which his possessions were liable.⁴ Tithes may be hastily regarded as derivable from legislative liberality, but a sufficient knowledge of our ancient history shews that they are not so. Our highest legal authority, chief

¹ Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 92. Sharon Turner, vol. i., p. 389.

² Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 93—95.

³ Rees's *Welsh Saints*, p. 114.

⁴ Soames, Preface, p. 5—7.

justice Blackstone, says at the original endowment of parish churches, the glebe and the tithes of the parish were vested in the then parson by the donation of the patron.¹

The whole framework of Anglo-Saxon society was religious. The throne of the prince rested upon the basis of Christianity, and the king's duties were considered to be religious no less than civil. Indeed, his former engagements took precedence, for when crowned, the first promise he gave was to preserve the Church of God in true peace. This, of course, could not be done, unless the property and privileges legally bestowed were guarded from spoliation and encroachment. The coronation compact reminded an Anglo-Saxon monarch that his principal title to the duty and obedience of his subjects rested on his acting as the Christian head of a Christian people. "England has, therefore, inherited a constitution from the most venerable antiquity, which recognizes attention to the spiritual wants of men, as the first and most important of a sovereign's duties."²

Many persons in the present day assert that the state should have nothing to do with religion, and that religion should not in any way be connected with the state; that any other arrangement interferes with "civil and religious liberty," and is injurious to the growth and progress of true religion, which is entirely a personal matter between man and his Maker. These ideas are of modern origin. In patriarchal ages religion was taught by the heads of families. In the case of Abraham this is mentioned by the Almighty as a reason for a blessing upon him. "For I know him that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord." Gen. xviii. 19. When God selected one nation to be his own peculiar people, the same idea prevailed, whether judges, kings, or priests were in power. It is true that the Jewish government was a theocracy, and had many things peculiar to itself; but thus much may be inferred from its constitution—that it is lawful for the sovereign authority to direct in matters of true religion. If it were wrong for the state to be united in religion, can we conceive that God would have so interwoven Church and state in the Jewish nation?³ Who can read of Jehoshaphat "sending Levites and priests to teach in all the cities of Judah," 2 Chr. xvii. 7—9, or of Josiah "making all that were present in Israel to serve the Lord their God," 2 Chron. xxxiv. 31, 32, without admiring the zeal by which they were influenced, and feeling that these things are recorded for the example and benefit of future ages? But if it is said that we live under a different dispensation, and Christ has decided against the union of church and state by saying, "My kingdom is not of this world;" let us consider what light our Lord's conduct casts upon this subject. He was found in the temple and the synagogue; he

¹ Blackstone's *Commentaries*, vol. i., p. 384—vol. ii., p. 23.

² Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 276.

³ Milner's *Church History*, p. 267.

joined in the public services and sanctioned by his presence the established religion of his country. He did more; for while condemning the character of the teachers, he taught the people to hear them as sitting in Moses's seat. He censured the men, but he honoured their office and their ordinances. With regard to the much perverted text quoted above, the eminent nonconformist doctor Doddridge remarks, "Jesus answered Pilate, My kingdom is not of this world, it is not my design to erect a temporal dominion and establish a claim which should interfere with that of Cæsar. Had I entertained such views my servants would have fought; but now my kingdom is not from hence, nor to be erected here; therefore, so far from arming my servants with weapons, I forbade their making use of those they had." In Isaiah xlix. 23, we read, "Kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and queens thy nursing mothers." We see this text fulfilled by a careful study of primitive Christianity in our own country, where religion has been so interwoven with the history of our state that to separate them would be to overthrow the fabric. Whether men like the expression of 'alliance between Church and state' or not, there is a natural connection between government and religion. Our Church offers the privileges of her worship to the whole community; but she speaks not the language of compulsion; her arms are the weapons of the gospel; her appeals are in the spirit of Christian love; and so long as she continues to rest on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone, she will remain firm as a rock against the assaults of her enemies; and, to quote the words of an old reformer, will prove herself to be "the anvil that has worn out many a hammer."¹

¹ Milner, p. 271. *Religious Establishments tried by the Word of God*, by W. Dealtry, D.D., chancellor of the diocese of Winchester.

CHAPTER VIII.

CENTURY VIII.

SYNOD OF OLOVESHOO, A.D. 747. RISE OF MOHAMMEDANISM.

CHARLEMAGNE. OFFA.

DURING this and the preceding century many attempts were made by holy men from Britain and Ireland to teach the gospel to the barbarous tribes in Holland, Belgium, and Germany. The latter country is more indebted to our nation than to any other for the light of Christianity. An Anglo-Saxon called Willibrod went with twelve companions into Friesland, which is now part of Holland, and there taught the people the Christian religion. He did good work amongst them for fifty years, dying about A.D. 741. He was made archbishop of Utrecht.¹

The most noted of our missionaries was an Anglo-Saxon named Winfrid, a native of Kirton, in Devonshire, who is more generally known under his latin name of Boniface, from which circumstance Englishmen are apt to overlook the fact of his being their countryman. He had been brought up from childhood in a monastery, and went into Friesland about the year 716, but being unable to work there at that time, returned into England. Afterwards he travelled to Rome, and presenting himself to Gregory II., who may be called the first pope,² offered to Christianize the pagan tribes in Germany. This Gregory encouraged him to do, and he therefore returned to Friesland, and worked with the aged Willibrod, archbishop of Utrecht. He then went into the more eastern part of the country, which we now call Bavaria, reforming the churches previously founded, whose members had fallen away from the faith, and converting those who had not heard the glad tidings of the gospel. Some time afterwards he revisited Rome, and was consecrated bishop of the new German churches under the name of Boniface. The latin name was probably substituted for the Anglo-Saxon one of Winfrid, as being more likely to secure respect from the German converts to the Roman see. The pope, keeping his own supremacy in view, caused the new bishop to take an oath of allegiance to the see of Rome. He was encouraged and protected by Charles Martel, who governed the Franks, whose dominions extended a good way into Germany.

¹ Milner, p. 443. Bede, b. v., ch. xi.

² In using this expression it is not meant that the title had not been applied to previous bishops of Rome, but that the title now carried with it that claim to supremacy which has ever since been asserted. It must be remembered that the word 'pope' means 'father,' and the early application of it bore a very different meaning to the supremacy which was now claimed by the Romish see. The title was at first given generally to the clergy, and is still so given in the eastern Church.

The bishop's labours were very successful; but he often suffered great hardships, and at times supported himself by the work of his hands, and was exposed to extreme peril by the savage pagans. He displayed an attachment to the Roman see, but taught no false doctrine, and always opposed idolatry and immorality, shewing an uniform zeal and finishing his course in the meekness and patience of a disciple of Christ. His love for monastic institutions and his regard for the see of Rome were made obedient to his stronger love for true piety and virtue.¹

Winfred (we will continue his Anglo-Saxon name) appears to have kept up a communication with his native country. The Anglo-Saxons had at this time fallen into habits of luxury and intemperance; and this good bishop being concerned to hear of these corrupt habits, which he found had commenced at the court of the Mercian king, wrote to that prince urging him to reform his conduct, saying it was the bounty of God and not his own merits that had raised him to his kingly station, and that it would be the worst ingratitude for a person so favoured to engage himself as a vassal to the kingdom of darkness. This letter had a good effect upon the prince. As the churches founded by Winfred were too numerous to be governed by one bishop, he was made archbishop of Metz by pope Gregory III., A.D. 732, and became primate (or head) of the churches in Germany and Belgium, where he founded several bishoprics, and in 744 the famous monastery of Fulda. In his old age he had a desire to revisit the scene of his early labours in Friesland; but his pious character was ill appreciated by the heathen portion of that barbarous people, as they murdered him, together with fifty of his fellow-labourers, A.D. 753. Winfred (or Boniface) was distinguished by the honourable title of apostle of the Germans.²

An Irish missionary called Virgilius, whose native name was Feargall, went with others to some parts of Germany, and became bishop of Salzburg. He died A.D. 780. A priest from Northumbria, named Villehad, was very successful amongst the Saxons in Germany, where he underwent hardships and dangers, and overcame the violent spirit of the natives by his meekness. He laboured for thirty-five years, during two of which he was bishop of Bremen on the Weser. In his dying moments he said to his weeping friends, "Withhold me not from going to God. These sheep I recommend to him who entrusted them to me, and whose mercy is able to protect them."³

Some writers undervalue the work of these missionaries, and especially that of Winfred, on account of their reverence for the see of Rome, and some superstitions to which they were addicted. But let us consider their situation and our own. We pride ourselves on our superior knowledge, which we regard when

¹ Milner, p. 443—447.

² Collier, vol. i., p. 296. Mosheim, vol. i., p. 471.

³ Milner, p. 448.

compared with theirs as the light of the sun contrasted with the glimmering of a star; but it would be well for us, both individually and nationally, if we strove to imitate the untiring zeal, the useful devotion, the earnest love of our early monks and bishops. When we study their history we find that, notwithstanding some ignorance and error, much real Christian goodness lay at the root of their labours; and we need not doubt that their work was acceptable to God, though it might not be wholly free from the errors and superstitions connected with the time in which they lived.

A synod was held at Cloveshoo, in Kent, by Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 747, which was attended by Ethelbald, king of the Mercians, eleven bishops, and several of the clergy and nobility. The following are the heads of some of the canons that were passed on this occasion:—In the first canon, the bishops were directed to maintain the canons of the Church against all encroachment, and to be themselves remarkable for uprightness, self-denial, and learning, so as to be examples to their people. In the second canon, bishops and clergy were recommended to keep on good terms with each other, without flattering applications to any person, considering that they were the servants of the same Master, and intrusted with the same commission; and, therefore, though they were divided by distance of place and country, they ought to be united in affection and pray for each other, that every one might discharge his office with integrity. These two canons, but especially the last, seem to be drawn on purpose to guard the liberties of the Anglo-Saxon Church against the pretensions of Rome.

In other canons, the bishops were desired to visit their dioceses every year, and the clergy were reminded of their holy calling and directed to preach, baptize, and inspect the conduct of the laity in the districts assigned to them by their respective bishops. From hence it appears that the dioceses were in a measure formed, and the lines of parishes in some degree marked out. They were also directed to make themselves thoroughly acquainted with the doctrines and service of the Church, to teach the Creed and Lord's Prayer in Anglo-Saxon, and to explain the sacraments to the people. They were desired to be uniform in their services, and to baptize, preach, and govern with the same rites and by the same rules. One canon regulated the Church music, and provided for the solemnity of the performance.

The religious observance of the Lord's day was ordered. All secular business and travelling, except in cases of necessity, was to be avoided; and the people were to be called to church to hear the word of God and receive the sacraments. Another canon mentioned that if any disorder proved too strong for the bishop's correction, he was to acquaint the archbishop with it at the meeting of the next synod; but not a word was said of carrying the complaint to Rome. The twenty-sixth canon set forth the proper exercise of charity, and declared that "alms are not given to commute for penance, to dispense with the discipline of the

Church, or procure us liberty for sinning; that those who think the justice of God can be bribed in this manner make their charity insignificant and bring an addition to their guilt; that alms signifies mercy both in the name and thing; and that they are no less a charity to the giver than to the receiver." This canon is evidently suggested by the words of St. Paul (Acts xx. 35), and our great poet refers to this view of the subject when he says,—

“The quality of mercy is not strain'd;
* * * * * It is twice bless'd;
It blesseth him that gives, and him that takes.”

SHAKESPEARE.

Directions were given for the singing of psalms, and prayers were set forth both for the living and the dead. The prayer for the latter runs thus:—“O Lord, we beseech thee, for thy great mercy grant that the soul of such a person may be secured in a state of peace and repose, and that he may be admitted, with the rest of thy saints, into the regions of light and happiness.” The last canon directed that prayers for kings and princes, and for the country generally, should be offered up in church.

The bishops of the following sees were present at the synod of Cloveshoo:—

<i>Sees.</i>	<i>Kingdoms.</i>	<i>Sees.</i>	<i>Kingdoms.</i>
Rochester . .	Kent	Winchester . .	West Saxons
London . .	East Saxons	Sherborne . .	”
Leicester . .	Mercia	Selsey . . .	South Saxons
Lichfield . .	”	Dunwich . .	East Angles
Lindsey . .	”	Helnam . .	”
Worcester . .	”		

The archbishop of York and the bishops of Lindisfarne, Hexham, and Whitehern were not present.¹ The other Saxon sees of Crediton, Wells, Ramsbury, and Cornwall were founded about 909, but a British bishopric had existed in Cornwall in very early times.

About A.D. 750, archbishop Cuthbert introduced the practice of enclosures near to the churches or monasteries for the burial of the dead. Hence is the origin of churchyards. Before this time the dead had usually been interred near the highways, according to the custom of the Romans, or in burial places remote from the cities.²

Many persons imagine that most of the corruptions for which the Church of Rome became remarkable in after years belonged to her at this period, and that the British Church shared in all her errors. This is a mistake, as can easily be shown, and might as easily be known, if people, divesting their minds of party prejudice, would study and inquire into the history of the Church. By God’s blessing on our island home, our Church was kept free from corruption for a longer period than any other part of Europe; but it is advisable to point out such evils as had appeared by the

¹ Collier, vol. i., p. 303—308.
² Note in Milner, p. 488.

middle of this century, and these were—celibacy, the multiplication of monasteries, a superstitious reverence for the relics and tombs of saints and martyrs, miracles, pilgrimages, and prayers for the dead.

Celibacy was highly applauded in both sexes. Those who renounced marriage and retired from the world, were held in great repute for sanctity. Doubtless, many who thus acted, sincerely believed they were doing what was pleasing in the sight of God; but the motives of others were less pure, and to many it became a mere fashion or a snare. Bede speaks of those who adopted celibacy with marked respect.¹

Monasteries had become very numerous. It was considered highly meritorious to build them and to bestow gifts of land for their support. Most of these religious houses were regulated in accordance with their profession as homes for students and nurseries for the Church; their inmates fed the hungry, relieved the sick, housed the traveller, taught the studious, and warned sinners of their evil way; but others, as the venerable Bede remarks, did not deserve the name of religious houses, but abused the privileges they possessed and became abodes of idleness and profligacy.

The reverence for the relics and tombs of the early saints and martyrs was extended to those of other holy men who had gone to their rest. Miraculous cures were said to be performed at these places. Bede relates the “miracles” that occurred at the place where king Oswald of Northumbria had been slain.² People flocked to the spot, and even the earth was carried away in the full belief that it would cure all ills.

Pilgrimages to the tombs of holy persons, or to places which had been hallowed by their good deeds, were very frequent. These pilgrimages were considered beneficial to the souls of men, and pleasing to God. Boniface, the “apostle of the Germans,” saw the evil attendant on this practice, which was an encouragement to idleness and a source of scandal. In a letter to archbishop Cuthbert, he urged him to restrain the women of Britain from going on pilgrimage, and said that they ought to be stopped either by royal authority, or by that of a synod. The pilgrims not only proceeded to places in their own country, but Rome and the Holy Land received many such visitors. Rome was still the most civilized city in western Europe, and boasted of the most extensive learning.³

Prayers for the dead had come into practice, as was seen by one of the canons of the synod of Cloveshoo. It was believed that they might be beneficial whilst the soul of man reposed after death, waiting as it were for the day of judgment.⁴

The condition of Rome and Italy became more corrupt, and

¹ Bede, b. iv., ch. 19.

² Bede, b. iii., ch. 13.

³ Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, pp. 98, 99.

⁴ Collier, vol. i., p. 306.

when we consider the changes that had occurred in the government of that country, we cannot feel much surprised at this result. The power of the Roman see, which was now rapidly increasing, proceeded from many causes, not the least of which was the deep reverence felt for it by many of the missionaries who laboured amongst the barbarous European tribes at this time. Their disciples readily received the idea of the bishop of that imperial city being the head of the Christian Church. Many chiefs who had formed principalities or kingdoms were desirous to strengthen their position with their new subjects. They saw that the clergy and bishops received from the people much consideration and respect, and that the bishop of Rome obtained a similar consideration from these bishops. They therefore found it conducive to their interest to gain the favour of the principal clergy by loading them with benefits; and through them they sought to please the Roman bishop, who was not slow to take advantage of this state of affairs.

The kings and princes of western Europe were frequently employed in usurping power, or in defending that which they had already acquired; and they endeavoured to secure the attachment of their principal followers by gifts of cities, land, and fortresses, together with various rights and privileges, reserving to themselves the supreme dominion and also the military service of these powerful vassals. They considered it prudent also to distribute donations among the bishops and chief clergy, for they hoped through them to check the turbulent spirit of the warlike nobility, by whom they were highly respected, and whose superstitious fears were aroused by the spiritual power which they possessed. In short, the excessive influence to which the bishops attained arose in the first instance from the self-interest of the temporal power, and not only as some imagine from superstition. The barbarous nations who received the gospel looked upon the bishop of Rome as the successor of their chief druid or high priest, and transferred to him the honours and authority which had formerly been vested in that awful person. Thus the see of Rome at length attained that high pre-eminence and despotic power in civil and political matters which led eventually to such misery in Europe.¹

In Britain an increasing reverence for the see of Rome was evidenced by the circumstance of the king of Northumbria sending for the pall for archbishop Egbert; and it was further shown by the retirement of some of the Anglo-Saxon princes to that city; but her supremacy over the Church of these islands was not yet allowed.

Images had begun to appear in churches about six hundred years after Christ, but they were not then regarded as objects of worship. In process of time, however, people began to adore them, and it is probable that this practice began with the heathen converts. Another error was likewise creeping into some portions of the Christian Church. Prayers were addressed not to God

¹ Mosheim, vol. i., pp. 486, 487.

only, but also to the spirits of the holy dead, in the belief that they could aid sinful mortals by interceding for them with their Creator.

About A.D. 727, Leo, emperor of the east, assembled the people at Constantinople; and openly opposed the adoration of images, together with the veneration for relics and the intercession of saints. The bishop (or patriarch) of Constantinople supported the use of images, and wrote on the subject to pope Gregory II. The emperors of the east were still the nominal monarchs of Rome and part of Italy, the exarchs of Ravenna being their lieutenants; but the imperial power in that country was really very slight. Gregory warmly opposed the emperor's wishes and supported the bishop of Constantinople in his advocacy of the question. Leo had issued an edict in which the worship of images was forbidden, and which required that all images should be removed from the churches excepting that which represented the crucifixion of Christ. The news flew to Rome, and Gregory desired the emperor to revoke his edict. This he refused to do, and Gregory thereupon declared him unworthy of the privileges of the Church. However good the intentions of Leo, he had acted too hastily, and with want of prudence; and no sooner were the Roman bishop's sentiments made known than the inhabitants of the Roman and other Italian provinces rose in arms, and either killed or banished all the officers of the emperor, whose statues were pulled down; and attempts were made to elect another sovereign, which were said to have been encouraged by Gregory.

This imperious prelate, who as we have previously observed may be styled the first pope, died A.D. 741, and was succeeded by Gregory III., who followed in his steps. The letters which this pope wrote to the emperor were in the most haughty terms, and Leo refused to hold any further intercourse with him. Gregory in a council excommunicated all those who spoke against or removed images. When Constantine removed the seat of the empire to Constantinople, Rome with its adjacent territories was commonly called the Roman dukedom. The inhabitants of the dukedom thus encouraged by these two popes threw off all allegiance to the emperor of the east.

Upon the death of Leo, his son Constantine succeeded to the empire. He held the same opinions as his father, and called a council at Constantinople A.D. 754, in which the worship of images was unanimously rejected. At this council three hundred and thirty-eight bishops were present. They said that Jesus Christ had delivered us from idolatry, and taught us to adore him in spirit and in truth; but that the devil, not being able to endure the beauty of the Church, had insensibly brought back idolatry under the appearance of Christianity, persuading men to worship the creature.

From this time the temporal power of the popes may be dated; but their spiritual power was as yet confined within somewhat narrow limits. They were obliged to convene a council or synod

when any religious differences were to be decided. When controversies occurred in the provinces, they were decided by provincial councils, in which the respective bishops gave their opinions freely and often in direct opposition to the pope. The power of assembling a general council still belonged to the emperor, and that of calling provincial councils to the princes in whose dominions they were held. Thus the authority of the popes was restrained for a time by the civil power; but those who governed the Roman see fretted under the curb.¹

It is not necessary to enter minutely into the history of Italy. The Lombards, who had been settled for some years in the northern part, took possession of those portions which were subject to the emperor of the east, of which Ravenna was one of the chief cities. They even meditated the conquest of Rome itself. About this time the king of the Franks was deposed by one of his principal subjects, named Pepin; but to ease his conscience for this piece of rebellion, Pepin and those devoted to his interests sent to Rome to ask pope Zachary's opinion as to their right so to act. At this period the pope was in great need of help against both the emperor and the Lombards; he therefore determined to secure the friendship of Pepin by sending him a favourable answer, which was confirmed by the next pope, Stephen II., who undertook a journey into France, A.D. 754, to obtain the assistance of Pepin against the Lombards. In this he succeeded; and Pepin crossed the Alps, defeated the Lombards, and obliged them to give up Ravenna and all the cities and castles belonging to the Roman dukedom. The Lombard king, however, again invaded these territories; but Pepin returned into Italy and regained possession of the cities, which he gave to the pope and his successors, and thus the popes became temporal sovereigns.²

The Christian churches in Asia and Africa were now overrun by the followers of Mohammed. This false prophet was born at Mecca, in Arabia, about the year 570, and assumed the prophetic office about 612. He was a deadly foe to Christianity, and his Arab disciples spread their religion at the point of the sword. They besieged and conquered Jerusalem A.D. 637, and on the ground where had stood the temple of Solomon, a Mohammedan mosque arose, while the land of the apostles, the cradle of our faith, became a prey to the infidel invaders. They overran Egypt, and the burning of the celebrated library of Alexandria is attributed to their destructive tendencies. From thence the Saracens proceeded along the north of Africa, and during the early part of the eighth century they extended their conquests to Spain, where they encountered the Goths, whose kingdom they subdued, and took possession of the greater part of that country. They also threatened France, and advanced as far as Poitiers; but their further progress was stopped by Charles Martel, father of

¹ Milner, p. 438—440. Mosheim, vol. i., p. 495, and pp. 500, 511, 512.

² Mosheim, vol. i., p. 489—491.

Pepin, who gained a signal victory over them near Avignon, A.D. 737. The Saracens retained their possessions in Spain till the close of the fifteenth century, when they were conquered by Ferdinand and Isabella, the Christian sovereigns of the other portion of that country, and were compelled to retire to Africa. On that continent, where a flourishing Church had previously existed, and from whence many learned and zealous Christians had arisen, the light of Christianity was totally extinguished; and the religion of the false prophet took its place and prevails to this day.¹ In Asia the spread of Mohammedanism, which continues to be one of the predominant religions in that quarter of the globe, was still greater. During this and the preceding centuries, Constantinople was twice besieged by the Saracens; but that city did not fall into their hands till about the middle of the fifteenth century, when after a siege of fifty-three days Mohammedanism triumphed: the Christian church of St. Sophia, celebrated from early times, became a temple of the false prophet, and the infidel invaders swarmed over the adjacent country, where the Ottoman empire still holds its sway. Christianity has not yet regained her lost position in the city and territories of the great Constantine, though the Sultan's power shines with greatly diminished splendour.

Whilst the power and riches of the popes increased on the one side, they received a check on the other; as the emperor Leo and his son Constantine, irritated by their conduct, took away the lands that had been given to the Roman see in Sicily and the south of Italy, and placed them under the spiritual care of the patriarch of Constantinople. This may be considered the source and leading cause of that great contest between the pope and the patriarch which divided the greek and latin churches in the ninth century and was so injurious to the interest of Christianity.

The Lombards were determined not to give up the rich plains of northern Italy without another struggle, which commenced after the death of Pepin. His son, the celebrated Charlemagne, who was entreated by pope Adrian I. to come to his assistance, marched into Italy, A.D. 774, completely overthrew the kingdom of the Lombards, which had existed for two hundred years, drove the king as an exile into France, and caused himself to be proclaimed in his place. He then went on to Rome, and not only confirmed the grants made by his father to the Roman see, but added to them new cities and provinces.²

The controversy on image-worship was still carried on with great bitterness on both sides. Three or four of the emperors at Constantinople had continued to fight the Church's battle on this question, but Leo IV. was poisoned, A.D. 780, with the connivance of his infamous wife Irene, who usurped the reins of power during the youth of her son. She then entered into alliance with pope

¹ Gibbon, see ch. li.

² Mosheim, vol. i., p. 492—496.

Adrian I., and the second council of Nice was summoned A.D. 786, which reversed the laws against image-worship that had been passed thirty-two years previously at the council of Constantinople. Adrian intimated to the empress Irene his approval of this proceeding, and sent the acts of the council to Charlemagne, that he might obtain the approbation of the western bishops;¹ but neither they nor the monarch would agree to them. They were, however, sent by Charlemagne to Offa, king of Mercia, that the opinion of the Anglo-Saxon Church might be taken, and that king laid them before the clergy. England, though she had for some time paid deference to Rome, and sought pleasure and improvement by intercourse with her, and was no stranger to the custom of ornamenting churches, indignantly pronounced these decrees to be a grievous disgrace to Christianity, "the worship of images being that which God's Church altogether execrates."²

Charlemagne assembled a general council, A.D. 794, at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, in order to re-examine this important question, at which the pope's legates and three hundred bishops were present. It was decreed that the second council of Nice was no general council, and that images might be retained as ornaments in churches, but were by no means to be adored or worshipped, as such religious honour was only due to God.³

The name of Alcuin is celebrated as a scholar. He was born at York, and received his education there from archbishop Egbert, who was the friend of Bede, and from his successor Elbert, by whom he was chosen as his companion when he travelled abroad in search of books. Alcuin was ordained and made master of the school at York by Elbert. His fame as a teacher soon spread, and numbers came to seek that instruction from him which they could not get so well elsewhere. He went to Rome to get the pall for his pupil Eanbald, who had become archbishop of York; and on his return, when passing through Parma, he met with Charlemagne, who, though a soldier and conqueror, had a thirst for knowledge and a love for learning and learned men, qualities rarely combined in those times. Charlemagne wished Alcuin to remain with him, which he promised to do provided his sovereign and his friend archbishop Eanbald gave him permission. This was granted, and his new patron founded a school in one of his palaces at the head of which he placed Alcuin, and himself became one of his pupils. The monarch had been brought up to the use of arms, and was expert in riding and other manly exercises; but he had not learned to write, and, notwithstanding all his endeavours, never succeeded in becoming skilful in the use of his pen!⁴

Being anxious to benefit his country and to banish the deep ignorance that prevailed, Charlemagne was guided by the advice

¹ Mosheim, vol. i., p. 515. Milner, p. 441.

² Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 120.

³ Collier, vol. i., p. 329.

⁴ Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 108, and note, p. 110.

of Alcuin; and as one means of improving the education of the clergy, he desired the bishops to erect cathedral schools, and the abbots to open schools in their monasteries. The ignorance of the times, however, was more than either Charlemagne or Alcuin could dispel, and their noble efforts did not meet with the success which they deserved. All the learning to be met with at this time, with very slight exception, appears to have been confined to Britain and Ireland.¹

Alcuin, notwithstanding the generosity with which he was treated, pined for his native country, and at length obtained leave of absence; and though Charlemagne urged his return, three years passed away ere he was induced to come back to France, nor did he ever afterwards gain permission to visit Britain; but he was at length allowed to leave the court and retire to the monastery of St. Martin at Tours, where a crowd of students, many of whom came from Britain, assembled to benefit by his instruction.² In those days when books were scarce, learning was carried on by word of mouth; so that every thing depended upon the readiness and skill of the teacher. Alcuin closed his pious and useful life at Tours, A.D. 804.

The celebrated Caroline books are believed by some to have been the work of Alcuin. They were drawn up by command of Charlemagne, and were directed strongly against all degrees of image-worship. The writer or writers of these books say that if the poison of that error has made any impression, "this treatise supported by the Holy Scriptures may prove an antidote." They were written about three years after the second council of Nice, and were sent by Charlemagne to pope Adrian I. The pope wrote a reply in defence of the council; but there was little force in his arguments, and they had no effect on Charlemagne, or on those who had assisted him in the controversy, as appears by the council of Frankfort which was held a few years later.³

Thus we see in these disputes that the Britons, Germans, and Gauls were of opinion that images or statues might be preserved and placed in the churches; but that all worship of them is highly injurious and offensive to God.⁴

Charlemagne had for some time aspired to the empire of the west; and in the year 800, while the infamous Irene still reigned at Constantinople, and the affairs of the eastern empire were in a state of extreme confusion, he thought it a favourable time to promote his scheme. He accordingly set out for Rome where he was received with great satisfaction by pope Leo III., who, being glad to shake off the nominal dominion of the emperors of the east, entered into his views. He therefore persuaded the people to unite in favour of Charlemagne, and proclaim him emperor of the west. Charlemagne, on his elevation to the empire, seems to have reserved

¹ Mosheim, vol. i., p. 480.

² Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 110.

³ Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 110. Collier, vol. i., p. 330—332.

⁴ Mosheim, vol. i., p. 515.

to himself the supreme dominion only, and to have granted to the Church of Rome a subordinate power over that great city and the territories annexed, which was probably suggested to him by the ambitious pontiff as a matter of sacred obligation.¹

Charlemagne was a very remarkable character, sincerely anxious for the improvement of his people and the furtherance of religion. In addition to his noble stand against image-worship, other circumstances besides the ecclesiastical laws which he enacted prove his anxiety to check superstitious practices. But his efforts were hindered by the great attachment, which he inherited from his father Pepin, to the Roman pontiffs: these lordly bishops were the patrons and protectors of the superstitious errors which were creeping into the Church. His love for the Holy Scriptures was very great, and his zeal for the advancement of Christian knowledge was shown by his anxiety respecting the correction of some errors in the latin translation of the Scriptures in which he employed Alcuin, and he is even said to have spent a considerable part of his time during the last years of his life in the same pious work.²

The inhabitants of Ireland distinguished themselves beyond all other European nations during the eighth and ninth centuries by their love of learning and their study of the sciences. They travelled through the most distant lands to improve and to communicate their knowledge. We see them discharging with the highest reputation the duties of doctors or professors in France, Germany, and Italy during this and the following centuries.³

Offa, king of Mercia, was the contemporary of Charlemagne, and a powerful and unscrupulous prince. It is said of him that he never willingly abandoned anything which he had set his mind to accomplish, but carried out his plans without troubling himself to consider whether the means employed were good or evil; his life was consequently stained by many crimes. Ethelbert, king of East Anglia, visited the Mercian court as a suitor to the daughter of the king. While there, he was basely assassinated, and Offa took possession of the territories of the murdered prince.⁴

When king Offa felt his guilty life wearing away he was filled with remorse for this barbarous crime. It seems by his acts as if he thought he could obtain pardon and purchase the favour of heaven by performing some good works for the benefit of God's Church. He gave a large estate in land, A.D. 793, to the cathedral of Hereford, where the unfortunate Ethelbert had been buried, and soon after this, hearing that some relics of Alban, Britain's first martyr, had been found at Verulam, he went there, and caused the bones to be placed in a shrine plated with gold. Neither did his respect for St. Alban stop here, for he summoned a provincial council of the bishops and nobility to meet at Verulam, when it

¹ Mosheim, vol. i., p. 493.

² Mosheim, vol. i., p. 505.

³ Mosheim, vol. i., p. 508, and note in same.

⁴ Sharon Turner, vol. i., p. 406.

was agreed to build a church and monastery in the place where the relics were discovered. Offa then went to Rome to obtain the approbation of the pope, and was well satisfied with his reception. He visited the school or college which Ina, king of the west Saxons, had founded for the education of the English in that city, and settled a further maintenance upon it, ordering a penny to be collected yearly from every family in his dominions whose lands were of a certain value. In this he followed the precedent of Ina, who had given a similar endowment to the college. This donation from king Offa was afterwards called Peter pence, not out of deference to Rome, but because it was paid on the first of August (called St. Peter's ad Vincula), to perpetuate the discovery of St. Alban's relics which were found on that day. It was not a grant or acknowledgment to the pope, but a revenue settled for the benefit of the British school and the people of that nation who travelled thither.¹

Offa, on his return from Rome, completed the church and monastery of St. Alban's. The original church, which had been built a few years after the death of the martyr, was standing at this time, and it is probable that some portion of it may have been built into Offa's more stately structure. The fine Norman abbey church which now exists was erected during the latter years of the eleventh century, and a vast supply of materials collected from the ruins of the old Roman city of Verulam was re-used, and in it some of the columns of Offa's Anglo-Saxon church may still be seen. This splendid edifice which was added to in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries has fallen into much decay; but the work of restoration was commenced under the superintendence of Sir Gilbert Scott, and we quote the following from his interesting report to the earl of Verulam, the chairman of the restoration committee:—

“We learn from a document in the British museum that the abbot of St. Alban's (about A.D. 1308) renewed the marble sub-structure of the shrine of St. Alban, of which shrine the exquisite remains were lately discovered by Dr. Nicholson while opening out one of the walled-up arches.” The remains thus singularly recovered have been united with great skill, and the shrine set up in its original place. In it may be seen a small figure of king Offa holding a church in his hand.

Before leaving this subject it may be interesting to add that an abbot of St. Alban's, previous to the Norman conquest, found solidly arched subterranean passages of the Roman city of Verulam passing under the bed of the river—the tiles and stones of which he set apart. The next abbot discovered several stone floors, part of the foundation of a great palace, and the remains of many buildings.² Few subjects can be more interesting than the restoration of this noble church, linked as it is to the memory of Britain's first

¹ Collier, vol. i., pp. 334, 335.

² Note in Sharon Turner, vol. i.

martyr and connected with the earliest Christian ages. The recent creation of a bishop's see at St. Alban's is a fitting tribute to its past history.

War seems to have been the chief occupation of the Cymry or Welsh during this century. The fertile plains of South Wales invited the inroads of their Saxon neighbours, and consequently were more harassed than the more mountainous district of North Wales. The inhabitants retaliated with fire and sword, and made frequent and sudden attacks on the dominions of Offa which joined their border. This induced him to enter into a league with other Anglo-Saxon princes in order that they might check these inroads; but the Welsh were able to retreat into the mountainous parts of their country, whither the Saxons could not follow. Offa then endeavoured to mark the confines of each territory, or to give greater security to his own, by causing a deep dyke and high rampart to be made, which extended from the Dee, in Cheshire, to the mouth of the Wye. An interval of peace gave him the opportunity of finishing this work, which still retains the name of Clawdd Offa or Offa's Dyke. The Welsh were fully sensible of the check it gave to their arms, but concealed their feelings, until, acting in concert with the kings of Northumbria and the south Saxons, with whom they had formed an alliance, they suddenly beset the rampart, and attacked Offa who was unprepared for the assault. Some time afterwards an engagement took place upon Rhuddlan marsh between these parties, when the Welsh were defeated and their leader slain. The memory of this event has been carried down by an ancient ballad called "*Morfa Rhuddlan*," of which the notes are very plaintive. The Welsh were still very fond of music and esteemed skill in playing on their harp beyond any kind of learning.¹ King Offa died at the end of this century.

The purity of our Church was by this time becoming more dimmed. Ceremonies were multiplied; penances, rigorous fasts, and good works were looked on as an acquittal for sin. It is true that a certain amount of ceremonial adds to the solemnity of public worship: without it men are apt to fall into irreverent habits, and to treat holy things and holy places with no more respect than the furniture of their houses, forgetting that that which is set aside for the service of God is hallowed by that use. On the other hand, when too much importance is attached to ceremonial, it tends to superstition; and the evils to which both extremes lead are still visible around us. Good works were also taking the place of justification. It will be remembered that the synod of Cloveshoo had alluded to this error with regard to alms-giving, stating that alms are not given to procure us liberty for sinning, that God's justice is not to be bribed in that way.² The apostle St. James says our faith must be shown by our works, and that "faith

¹ Warrington's *History of Wales*, p. 101—109.

² Collier, vol. i., p. 306.

without works is dead" (ch. ii. 18, 20); but the Bible nowhere tells us that our works can atone for sin; for "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." 1 John i. 7.

The time of which we are writing was also marked by an increasing deference for the Roman see and a growing inclination to retire from public life and duties into the seclusion of the cloister. The religious houses continued to multiply, and the number of their inmates was largely increased by the reverence which was felt for the monastic life. But, as our poet Keble beautifully says,—

"We need not bid, for cloistered cell,
Our neighbour and our work farewell.

* * * * *

The trivial round, the common task
Would furnish all we ought to ask,
Room to deny ourselves; a road
To bring us daily nearer God."

Christian Year.

CHAPTER IX.

CENTURY IX.

EGBERT. ALFRED. INCREASE OF THE PAPAL POWER. THE DANES.

THE two last centuries were bright in Anglo-Saxon annals. In one we traced the progress of Christianity by the exertions of an Aidan, a Finan, a Diuma, a Chad, and an Oswald; and when we lost sight of the Irish Scots and the Britons as regards our ecclesiastical history, we saw the Anglo-Saxons rising as a nation and acquiring knowledge beyond that of other countries; for with the eighth century, what are generally called the dark ages commenced on the continent of Europe—the darkness of which the laborious efforts of the emperor Charlemagne, aided by the learned Alcuin, were unable to dispel. The literary fame of Britain seemed, however, to have reached its height during that century; it was well sustained by Adhelm, Bede, and Egbert, and became yet more noted when Charlemagne sought instruction from our Alcuin. But as the sun frequently shines most brightly when he is about to set, so was the intellectual lustre of this country succeeded by a dark night of ignorance and superstition. The ninth and tenth centuries were truly the dark ages of the whole of Europe.

Hitherto European nations detested the thought of paying the least mark of religious homage or adoration to images, notwithstanding that the bishops of Rome had zealously advocated this superstitious practice. They were of opinion that images might be retained only as recalling the pious and virtuous actions of the persons they represented. A council, held at Paris, A.D. 824, confirmed the decision of the council of Frankfort, which, allowing their use in churches, prohibited the smallest mark of religious homage; but towards the end of the ninth century the influence of the Roman pontiff prevailed, and the Gallican clergy began to pay a certain degree of devotion to saintly images, in which they were followed by the Germans and other nations.¹

The bishops of Rome had hitherto been elected by the bishops and people of their province, the election being subject to the approval of the emperor of the east, and, after the death of Charlemagne, to that of his successors in the western empire, who assumed the titles of emperor of Germany and king of Rome. During the ninth century the power of the popes increased prodigiously. The civil wars and disputes for the crown which took place amongst the descendants of Charlemagne led to this result, for the contending parties were each eager to avail themselves of the influence which superstition had given to the popes over the minds of the people. Charles the Bald obtained the empire A.D.

¹ Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 46.

876, through the good offices of the Roman see; and he repaid this obligation by delivering the succeeding popes from the necessity of obtaining the consent of the emperors in order to being installed in their office.¹

The increase of the Roman pontiff's power in spiritual matters now proceeded rapidly. The European princes suffered themselves to be divested of that influence in religious affairs which they had derived from Charlemagne.

Egbert, king of the west Saxons, had been obliged to leave his country in early life. He retired into France during the reign of Charlemagne, where he learnt the arts of war and government. The studious character of that great prince, whose friendship he possessed, led him to improve his mind, and when recalled to the throne of Wessex, A.D. 800, he gave full proof of his capacity. This kingdom and that of Mercia were now the principal divisions of the Saxon heptarchy,² and a great rivalry existed between them. Mercia had absorbed Kent, East Anglia, and Essex; but internal dissensions checked her power and independence, and Egbert eventually became her master. East Anglia and Kent also submitted to his rule. The whole of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms became his tributaries. He then turned to Wales, and entered Denbighshire as a conqueror. Anglesey, or the Angles' isle,³ received its modern name from Egbert. The Cornish Britons were subdued by him, and Cornwall became a portion of his kingdom.

During Egbert's reign, the Danes infested the coasts of Ireland and the whole island of Britain from north to south; and the Anglo-Saxons now felt those ravages of an invading foe which they had in former centuries themselves inflicted. These pirates from the Baltic coasts, who were also called Northmen or Sea Kings, were, however, far more destructive than the Saxons had been; for the latter had formed themselves into regular governments, and improved the country, whereas these new invaders seemed disposed only for mischief and devastation; their business appeared to be that of the spoiler and destroyer.⁴

Egbert died A.D. 836, and was succeeded by his son Ethelwulf, who had been brought up as a monk, and was more suited in such unquiet times for the life of a monastery than that of a court. He journeyed to Rome, and took with him his youngest son, Alfred, afterwards king Alfred the Great. The Anglo-Saxon school, which had been founded at Rome by Ina, king of the west Saxons, had been destroyed by fire, and was rebuilt by Ethelwulf.⁵

The charter which Ethelwulf granted to the Church, A.D. 855, with the consent of his witena-gemot, has been considered by many

¹ Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 19.

² We retain this title, though the Saxon kingdoms varied in number and in their relations to one another. See Freeman's *Norman Conquest*, vol. i., p. 22.

³ Sharon Turner, vol. i., p. 414, &c. Warrington's *History of Wales*, p. 138.

⁴ Collier, vol. ii., pp. 349, 361.

⁵ Sharon Turner, vol. i., p. 482.

as the grant of the tithes of the kingdom ; but it is now well known that tithe was a payment made during the earlier days of Christianity in these islands. "Ethelwulf," says Soames, "seems indeed merely to have obtained legislative authority for dedicating to religious uses, free from all secular burdens, a tenth of the royal domains," probably with the idea of founding monasteries. The right of the Church to tithe had been acknowledged as indefeasible long before his time.¹

A learned lawyer said to one who objected to the payment of tithes because they were due only by the law of man, "My cloak is mine by the law of man ; but he is a thief by the law of God who takes it away from me." A doctor of divinity in Cambridge had a dispute with an anabaptist upon this subject. "It goes against my conscience," said the latter, "to pay you tithes, except you can show me a place in Scripture whereby they are due unto you." To this the doctor replied, "Why should it not go as much against my conscience that you should enjoy your nine parts for which you can show me no place in Scripture?" To this the other rejoined, "But I have for my lands deeds and evidences from my fathers, who purchased and were peaceably possessed thereof by the laws of the land." "The same is my title," said the doctor, "tithes being confirmed to me by many statutes of the land time out of mind." Thus the anabaptist was silenced, and having a share of conscience and common sense, was convinced of the obligation of paying his tithes.²

Ethelwulf took for his second wife Judith, daughter of the king of France, whom we name as having had considerable influence over Alfred during his early years. He was succeeded on the throne by three of his sons before the crown devolved on Alfred. During all this time the Danes or Northmen ravaged the country ; they usually came with a large fleet of vessels ; and as plunder was their principal object, they used to land and seize whatever they could obtain, spreading terror and desolation around, and then make off with their booty, until the want of or desire for fresh supplies induced them to return to that or some other portion of the coast. About A.D. 866, one of the largest invasions of Danes took place for the purpose of avenging the death of Ragnar Lodbrog, one of their leaders, who had disturbed the peace of many places in Europe ; for the ravages of these Northmen were not confined to the British Isles. They landed on the coast of East Anglia (Norfolk and Suffolk), and finally settled in part of the kingdom of Northumbria, which was at that time plunged in civil war, and therefore became an easy prey. Mercia was also threatened by them, but the king of the west Saxons, with the assistance of his brother, Alfred, drove them back ; they retired, however, with great booty to York. In the spring of 870 their residence in Britain was marked by the most cruel ravages ; language cannot

¹ Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 137. See Sharon Turner, vol. i., p. 479.

² Collier, vol. i., p. 372.

describe the devastation they wrought. "We can only enumerate," says the writer from whom we are quoting, "harvests destroyed, towns, villages, churches, monasteries, and libraries ransacked and burnt."¹

It was at this period that the Northmen plundered and destroyed the famous monasteries of Croyland, Peterborough, and Ely. A gallant band of Anglo-Saxons, under earl Algar, who had tried to check their progress, were nearly all cut to pieces. The few that escaped slaughter fled to Croyland, bearing to the abbot the dismal tidings and apprising him of the near approach of the enemy. The abbot sent those who could flee to a place of safety, whilst the old and the young, and those who were unable to escape, took refuge with him in the abbey church, and gave themselves to prayer. Soon the barbarians were upon them; the venerable abbot was slain by the altar, old men and children were seized and tortured to induce them to show the place where the treasure was hid, the monastery was burnt, and next day the cruel Danes marched with much plunder to Peterborough. The architecture of this monastery was the glory of the age. Its valuable library, with its books and records, comprised the collection of two centuries. The monks resisted their enemies with all the means in their power; but their resistance was of little avail. The Danes burst into the building and slaughtered the abbot and every inmate, and after setting the monastery on fire, proceeded to Ely where they destroyed the church and monastery, with the innocent and unfortunate nuns.

The few monks of Croyland who had been sent away to a place of safety, returned to their home, after the departure of the Danes, and buried the remains of their slaughtered brethren. They proceeded to Peterborough for the same melancholy purpose, and interred the bodies of the monks with that of the abbot in one large grave, placing over it a pyramid of stone, round which their images were afterwards engraven in memory of the catastrophe.² Some years ago we were shewn a stone in the beautiful cathedral of Peterborough, on which was a very ancient inscription in memory of those monks who had been slaughtered by the Danes.

Alfred the Great (who well merited that title) was born about the year 849, at Wantage, in Berkshire, and brought up as a huntsman and a warrior. At twelve years of age he could not read. His step-mother, Judith, bribed him to learn by the promise of a poem, which was beautifully written, and to which he had listened with great pleasure whilst it was recited in the royal presence. After this, he found that a knowledge of Latin was necessary to enable him to gain further instruction, and he resolved to learn the language; but teachers were scarce.³ Nevertheless, he set all difficulties aside, and diligently sought instruction; and his writings give sufficient proof of his industry and perseverance.

¹ Sharon Turner, vol. i., pp. 498, 503.

² Sharon Turner, vol. i., p. 508 to 513. See Camden, vol. i., p. 523.

³ Sharon Turner, vol. i., pp. 492, 495.

The good use which he made of his talents in such a stormy and unsettled age is very remarkable, so that Englishmen are justly proud of Alfred the Great.

Alfred was called to the throne A.D. 871. He was at first unfortunate; for the Danes were very powerful, and the country had become divided between them and the west Saxons. Having fought no less than eight pitched battles during one year, and suffered many defeats, which made him unpopular, he was soon overwhelmed with misfortunes. Deserted by his people, and broken in spirit, he concealed himself in the little island of Athelney, in Somersetshire, where he took refuge with one of the royal herdmen, describing himself as a thane who had been defeated with the king in battle, and obliged to fly from his enemies. The man believed his story, and, moved with pity, supported him with the necessaries of life. The following circumstance is related by his friend Asser, who wrote his life: "He led a very unquiet time at his cowherd's. It happened on a certain day the wife of this man prepared to bake her bread. The king, sitting near the hearth, was making ready his bow and arrows and other warlike instruments, when the woman beheld the loaves burning at the fire. She ran hastily to remove them, scolding, and exclaiming, 'Oh! man, you will not turn the bread you see burning; but you will be very glad to eat it when done.' The woman little thought she was addressing the king." It is stated that Alfred rewarded the herdman handsomely for his hospitality, and finding that he possessed talent he recommended him to study and become an ecclesiastic, which advice he followed, and eventually became bishop of Winchester.¹

After passing six months in this retreat, often pondering on the best means of surprising the Danes, Alfred resolved to disguise himself as a harper, for which character his taste for music and poetry especially fitted him. Leaving his hiding place, he approached the Danish camp, within which his harp obtained for him a ready admittance. There is nothing improbable in this tradition, which is not inconsistent with the manners of the times. Having been thus enabled to notice the position of his enemies, he sent confidential messengers to his principal friends, who secretly collected a body of followers. These were joined by the king; and, as his people had suffered greatly in his absence, and imagined him to be dead, they hailed his return with joy. When ready for battle he gave a short address to his men, telling them they were to fight for their parents, their wives and children, and above all for the honour of God and the interest of his Church.² After a hard struggle he defeated the Danes, and followed them to their stronghold, where, being worn out by cold and famine, their chief, Godrun, begged for mercy. Alfred tried to turn his enemies into allies by giving them the country

¹ Sharon Turner, vol. i., pp. 548, 552.

² Sharon Turner, vol. i., p. 558. Collier, vol. i., p. 381.

of East Anglia to cultivate and colonize, on condition that they became Christians.

It must not be supposed that Britain's troubles ended with this battle; for the Danes continued to make descents on the coast, and on one occasion, under their chief, Hastings, sailed up the Thames and committed great havoc. The king, however, was in the end victorious, and peace prevailed. The Danes, who had settled in Northumbria about twelve years before, had turned their swords into ploughshares, and Alfred hoped that those to whom he gave East Anglia would follow their example. He stipulated with them for the payment of tithes upon their estates, and imposed fines for the nonpayment of the same. We thus see that in Alfred's time civil penalties protected the clergy in their maintenance, and the Church in her dues.¹

Alfred may be called the father of the English navy. He had a hundred and fifty war galleys, and with these he often checked the Danes on the coast, and even defeated them on their own element. He divided the country into counties, with a further division of the latter into hundreds. Courts leet and the office of sheriff were also of his institution. He built two monasteries—one at Athelney, in Somersetshire, and another at Winchester. The devastations of the Danes had brought monastic life into disuse, and the married clergy had become possessed of several monasteries. Alfred also founded a nunnery at Shaftesbury, of which he made his eldest daughter abbess.² The destruction of monasteries by the Danes tended to the increase of parochial clergy and the further establishment of parochial churches.

In a letter to the bishop of London, Alfred complained of the want of education amongst both clergy and laity. Although formerly the British clergy were so famed for their learning that strangers resorted to them for instruction, the case, as he said, was now so miserably altered that there was need "to travel to learn what we used to teach," and that there were very few that could either translate a piece of Latin, or so much as understand the liturgy in their mother tongue.³ No doubt the continued invasions of the Danes, and the wars attendant upon them, had left the harassed natives little leisure or inclination for study.

Of those scholars whom Alfred drew to his court the first who should be named is Asser, a monk of St. David's, the friend, preceptor, and biographer of the king. In his memoir of this prince, Asser gives an account of the invitation he received from him, of the benefits that were promised should he accept it, and of his unwillingness to leave St. David's for the sake of gain. Alfred, however, was urgent, and entreated him to give a portion of his time, if he could not spare all. "Be with me for six months," said the monarch, "and spend the other six months in Wales." Asser

¹ Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 155.

² Collier, vol. i., p. 382—386.

³ Collier, vol. i., p. 388.

consented, and joined the court of Alfred. Thus we see that learning had not departed from the Cymry, since this great king was so anxious to secure the assistance of a monk from St. David's in his search for knowledge.

Alfred sent an embassy of ecclesiastics and laymen to the archbishop of Rheims, with a request that he would permit Grimbald, a man of great piety and learning,¹ to come and reside at his court, and the permission was granted.

Another person of note who was induced to join this band of learned men was Johannes Scotus Erigena, or John the Irish Scot. He was in France at the time, but came to England on Alfred's invitation. An amusing anecdote (shewing his ready wit) is related of him while visiting Charles the Bald, king of France, afterwards emperor of Germany, with whom he was on terms of friendship and familiarity. Charles had somewhat rudely asked him what was the difference between a Scot and a sot,² which Scotus no doubt considered a reflection on himself and his people. He replied, looking at the king, who sat opposite to him, "No more than this table's breadth."³

John Erigena was a man of great genius; and his translations from the Greek, together with his other works, gained him a lasting reputation. He is noted for his writings with reference to a controversy that had sprung up concerning the manner in which the body and blood of Christ were present in the Holy Communion. "It had hitherto," says Mosheim, "been the unanimous opinion of the Church that the body and blood of Christ were administered to those who received the sacrament of the Lord's supper, and that they were consequently present at that holy institution; but the sentiments of Christians concerning the nature and manner of this presence were various and contradictory, nor had any council determined with precision that important point."⁴ The controversy on this subject was begun during this century by Paschasius Radbert, a monk, and afterwards abbot of Corbie, in France, who pretended to explain and determine the doctrines of the Church on this head. He composed, A.D. 831, a treatise, in which were the following propositions:—First, that after the consecration of the bread and wine in the Lord's supper, though they outwardly appear the same as before, the body and blood of Christ was really and locally present; and secondly, that the body of Christ thus present in the eucharist is the same body that was born of the virgin, that was crucified, and that rose from the dead. This new doctrine, more especially the second proposition, excited, as might be expected, the astonishment of many. Radbert's book was replied to by several, but by none with such spirit and effect as by John Scotus.⁵

¹ Sharon Turner, vol. ii., pp. 13, 14.

² Sot (French), a fool.

³ Dean Murray's *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, p. 85. Note in Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 161.

⁴ Mosheim, vol. ii., pp. 31, 49.

⁵ Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 49—51.

An abbot, called St. Neot, who was related to the king, was another of Alfred's learned companions, who showed great zeal and courage in promoting the interests of religion. He died in Cornwall, but his body was removed to Huntingdonshire, where a monastery was built; and the town derived its name of St. Neot's from that circumstance.¹

By the assistance of these learned men Alfred discovered persons of intelligence, and furnished them with opportunities of improvement, in order to fit them for the office of bishop; but fearing the learning of his clergy might die with them, he resolved to make some provision for the instruction of posterity. Asser relates that Alfred had already in 887 succeeded in mastering the Latin language, and could read Latin authors in the original. He therefore translated the pastoral of Gregory the Great into English, with a preface, written to Wulfsig, bishop of London. In this he entreats the bishop to spread his knowledge amongst the people as far as he can. "Consider," said he, "what punishment we have reason to expect even in this life if we neither take care of our own improvement nor consult the benefit of those who come after us. We vainly value ourselves upon the name of Christianity." Alfred observes that, before these late times of rapine and desolation, the churches were well stocked with books, and yet the people were little the better for them, because they were not written in their own tongue; and he says he was at first surprised that men of so great learning and piety in this country had in former ages omitted to translate some at least of them. He adds, "But then I considered that our ancestors had no apprehension we should have sunk to this ignorance, but imagined that people would be pushed to study by learning being locked up in other languages." The king further says that the Bible, which was revealed in the Hebrew tongue, had been translated into Greek, and afterwards into Latin, and every Christian had had some part of the inspired writing put into his own language;² "therefore," he adds, still addressing the bishop, "I think it better, if you think so, that we also translate some books the most necessary for men to know into our own language, so that the youth who are now in England may apply to no other duty till they first well know how to read English writing; then let them who will, proceed further to learn the Latin language." The king acted up to this intention, and translated several works into the Anglo-Saxon tongue, one of them being Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, which that author had written in Latin, and Alfred was engaged in a translation of the Psalms at the time of his death.³

We thus see how this good king endeavoured to provide for the security of religion, the study of learning, and the happiness of his people. The university of Oxford owes its foundation to him. He built and endowed three halls, and settled a revenue

¹ Collier, vol. i., p. 397.

² Collier, vol. i., p. 392.

³ Sharon Turner, vol. ii., pp. 19, 88, 95.

to educate about eighty scholars. Amongst the teachers appointed were Grimbald, Asser, and St. Neots. Thus it must be said in favour of Oxford that it has one of the most glorious English princes for its founder.

Alfred divided the twenty-four hours of day and night into three parts: eight for sleep and other refreshment; eight for reading, writing, and prayer; and eight for the dispatch of business.¹ He was very constant in his devotions, and attended public worship daily. Asser tells us that the king carried in his bosom a little book in which were written prayers and psalms; and that one of the uses of his knowledge of Latin was to translate passages of the sacred Scriptures and insert them in the book, which he called his manual, because he had it always at hand, and from which he derived no small comfort.²

Alfred paid great deference to the pope, but we meet with no letters of compliment or submission. There is no intercourse of legates upon record, no interference in the councils and regulations of the Church; by which we observe that our country was perfectly independent of the Roman see, though on friendly terms with it.³ The king seems to have summed up the principal ecclesiastical laws of Ina and Offa, as well as those of Ethelbert, the first Christian sovereign of Kent, and submitted them to his witenagemot, by which body they were solemnly confirmed. These laws were prefaced by the ten commandments; but the second does not appear in its proper situation, and only a slight hint of it is seen in the tenth place. It would thus appear that the Anglo-Saxons and their king no longer protested against image-worship. But England can claim amongst her sovereigns no name more distinguished than that of Alfred. It should be remembered also that he must have dissented from the doctrine of transubstantiation, that great feature of modern Romanism; for although it was in his time that this startling idea was first named, he patronized John Erigena, who was one of its most noted opponents.⁴

When we consider that at twelve years of age Alfred could not read, that his kingdom when he succeeded to the throne was overrun by fierce and ignorant invaders, that he had to seek instruction for himself as well as for his people, that he suffered from a weak and unhealthy constitution; and then, on the other hand, observe his care for his people, his wonderful economy of time and money, his intellectual efforts to improve the condition of his subjects; we feel lost in amazement; it seems as if we were looking back upon a prodigy of sense, virtue, and greatness. When we regard his religious character, it seems as if he had devoted himself to holy meditation. By his conduct as a soldier and commander, we might think the camp had been his home—by his writings, that the university had engrossed his time; and if we consider his skill and

¹ Collier, vol. i., pp. 393, 397, 399.

² Sharon Turner, vol. ii., p. 16.

³ Collier, vol. i., p. 401.

⁴ Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, pp. 156, 158.

prudence in the art of government, it is evident that he had made law and politics his study.¹ A German writer thus sums up his character: "As the greatest minds display themselves in the most turbulent storms on the call of necessity, so England has to boast among others her Alfred; a pattern for kings in a time of extremity, a bright star in the history of mankind. Alfred living a century after Charlemagne, was, perhaps, a greater man, in a circle happily more limited."² He was taken from his people October 26th, A.D. 900, or 901, at the age of fifty-three. We have dwelt somewhat fully on his character and reign, and feel that he well deserved the appellation of the Great, as a saint, a scholar, a hero, and a lawgiver.³

The power and influence exercised by the popes in civil affairs were greatly assisted by the unsettled state of the empire in this century. Their favour was solicited by the various competitors to the throne, and those who bid highest for their support were generally raised to the government of Italy and to the imperial dignity. The increase of their authority in religious matters advanced in the same proportion. The power of the bishops was greatly diminished, and the authority of provincial and general councils declined; but the latter affected the Church on the continent of Europe more than in our islands. The Roman pontiffs became more and more arrogant: they were bent upon persuading all, and did persuade many, that the bishop of Rome was appointed by Jesus Christ as supreme lawgiver and judge of the Church universal, that the bishops derived their authority from him, and that the councils could not decide any point without his permission. These claims were opposed by such persons as were acquainted with the government of the Church in its earlier ages, but their opposition proved vain.

The bishops of Rome found it necessary to support such haughty pretensions, and silence opponents by producing the authority of ancient deeds. They accordingly employed some of their most zealous partisans in forging acts of councils, epistles, conventions, and such like records, so that it might appear that in the first ages of the Church the Roman bishops possessed the same supreme spiritual authority which they now asserted. Such forgeries were in this century esteemed lawful on account of their supposed tendency to promote the glory of God, and to advance the prosperity of the Church. The most famous of their fictitious evidences were the so-called Decretal Epistles, said to have been written by the bishops of Rome in primitive times. The name of Isidore, bishop of Seville, who had lived in the sixth century, was prefixed to them to make the world believe they had been collected by that learned man; and they were produced with an air of triumph as evidence of the supremacy of the Roman pontiff. The decisions of a certain

¹ Collier, vol. i., p. 401.

² Note in Sharon Turner, vol. i., p. 593.

³ See Freeman's *Norman Conquest*, vol. i., p. 48.

council said to have been held at Rome were set forth; but such a council had never been heard of before this century, and the accounts now given of it proceeded from the same source as the Decretal Epistles. There were among the Latin bishops men of sagacity who saw through the cheat, and perceived the chains that were preparing for themselves and the Church. The French bishops especially distinguished themselves by their antagonism to these fraudulent records, but the obstinacy of the pontiffs, and the ignorance that prevailed in Europe, reduced their opposition to silence; and in the dark ages, truly so called, which succeeded this contest, we cannot wonder that such forgeries were believed in, since there remained scarcely any persons who were capable of detecting the impostures or disposed to support the liberty of the Church against the papal tyranny.¹

That part of Scotland south of the Forth and Clyde, forming part of the kingdom of Northumbria, now in the hands of the Danes, was under the religious superintendence of the archbishop of York. We have no information as to the time when the rest of that country was formed into parishes, or when or where the dioceses of the bishops were marked out. It is supposed that the boundaries of parishes were determined, as they had been in other parts of Britain, by those of the estates on which the churches had been built. As Christianity extended, the landlords felt additional reason for supplying their dependants with places of worship. But as regards the original distribution of the dioceses of Scotland, much obscurity prevails. Till a comparatively late period the greater part of the country, though nominally under one king, was really governed by the heads of a few powerful families. For a considerable time after the establishment of dioceses, and the erection of cathedrals in the south of Scotland, the bishops of the northern part sought an asylum in monasteries, and went forth into the surrounding district only when called upon to the discharge of the duties of their order. When the kingdom was strengthened by the union of the Scots and Picts, the episcopal see of St. Andrew's was constituted, it having been removed thither from Abernethy, about A.D. 840, by king Kenneth II.² The influence and even the memory of the Picts were extinguished by their successful rivals the Scots, and henceforth we hear of the latter people only. Kenneth appears to have been a prince of some note, judging by his civil and ecclesiastical laws; and though the former indicate the rudeness of the times, a few of the latter are worthy of remark. The days set apart in honour of our Saviour and the blessed saints were to be respectfully observed. Graves were to be accounted sacred, and a cross was to be set over them. Churches, priests, and all religious persons were to be treated with respect. Any injury or affront offered to a Christian priest was to be severely punished. A public funeral was to be given to those who had

¹ Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 22—24, and note in Mosheim, p. 23.

² Russell's *History of the Church in Scotland*, vol. i., p. 92—96.

been serviceable to their country.¹ In the reign of Constantine, the son of Kenneth, a synod was held at Scone, where it was decreed that the clergy should reside on their charges and not meddle with secular business, but instruct the people and give them a good example; that they should not keep hawks or hounds, or carry weapons, but should live contentedly on their own provisions; and if they transgressed on any of these points, they were to be fined for the first offence, and for the second deprived of their office and living. We gather from these laws that towards the end of the ninth century there were fixed charges allotted to individual clergymen, and that the Church constitution had assumed a regular form in connection with the civil government.²

In the earlier part of this century a large body of Danes landed in West Wales, and the Welsh resolved to unite with them in an attack upon the Saxons. They fought a severe battle with Egbert on Hengist Down, but were totally defeated. The Saxon king then invested Chester, which had hitherto remained in possession of the Welsh and was looked upon as an important frontier post, and took it. Later in this century the Danes, having received a check in England, entered the isle of Anglesey, where they met with a spirited resistance from Roderic (Rhodri Mawr), king of North Wales. At the same time South Wales was overrun by another body of Danes, who desolated that country, and laid churches and monasteries in ruins. Roderic possessed the sovereignty of the isle of Man, and having married Angharad, the heiress of South Wales, the province of Cambria had centred in him. He, however, appears to have been deficient in the qualities of a great prince, and suffered his dominion to be divided and governed by chieftains acting under his authority; neither did he take advantage of the season of tranquility, which the Welsh enjoyed while the Saxons were engaged in defending themselves from the inroads of the Danes, to use such measures as might have given security to his country. An interval of quiet from these enemies gave the Saxons an opportunity of invading Anglesey, and king Roderic fell in battle during that expedition.³ Towards the close of this century several synods were held in Wales under the bishop of Llandaff, in which some of the princes were excommunicated in consequence of the crimes they had committed, such as perjury, murder, and seizure of the revenues of the Church. Asser says that, about A.D. 887, the whole of South Wales belonged to king Alfred, its princes having put themselves under his protection.⁴ If so, it was only a temporary arrangement, as the independence of Wales was more or less maintained till long after that period.

The Danish marauders troubled Ireland even more than Britain;

¹ Collier, vol. i., p. 365.

² Russell, vol. i., p. 98.

³ Warrington's *History of Wales*, p. 139, and p. 141—145.

⁴ Collier, vol. i., p. 398.

fire and sword followed their footsteps; churches and monasteries were ruthlessly destroyed; priests and people fell victims to their fury. They possessed themselves of Armagh, the most eminent of Ireland's seats of learning, whence they expelled the archbishop, the monks, and the students. For about thirty years they remained masters of the country. The inhabitants then for a time got the better of them, but fresh arrivals of these pirates, or sea kings as they have been poetically called, continued to harass the natives. Dublin fell into their hands; but Armagh seems especially to have suffered, and the archbishop Dermot, called the "wisest of the doctors of Europe," died from grief or sickness caused by the ravages of these barbarians. Each of Ireland's provinces were by turns subjected to their invasions; the seaports were in their possession, by which means they were enabled to keep up communication with their own country; and until the beginning of the twelfth century, Irish history contains little but records of war and oppression.¹

¹ Sir James Ware's *Antiquities of Ireland*, ch. xxiv.

CHAPTER X.

CENTURY X.

ATHELSTAN. HOWEL DDA. EDGAR. DUNSTAN. THE BENEDICTINES.

THE tenth century has been called by cardinal Baronius an iron age, barren of all goodness; a leaden age, abounding in all wickedness; and a dark age, remarkable for the scarcity of writers and men of learning.¹ There is little to record of our Church during the first part of this century. Edward, called the Elder, succeeded his father Alfred. The Danes, who were settled in East Anglia and Northumbria, caused him anxiety; but after many struggles they submitted to Edward, who may be ranked as one of the founders of the English monarchy. He not only secured the Anglo-Saxons from a Danish sovereignty, but paved the way for the destruction of the Danish power. The Cymry also acknowledged him as their chief lord, and so did the king of the Scots, and the Britons of Strathclyde.²

About this time Gregory, king of the Scots, held a meeting of the estates at Forfar, when the following privileges were settled upon the clergy:—That all priests should be free from taxes and from military service; that they should be tried by the bishops, and not by the secular power; that wills and verbal contracts should be placed under the bishop's jurisdiction; and that all succeeding kings when crowned should swear to maintain the clergy in their rights and liberties.

The ceremony of crowning and anointing the Saxon kings appears to have been first practised in the reign of Alfred. At a synod held about A.D. 928, in the reign of Athelstan, the son of Edward the Elder, who was crowned by the archbishop of Canterbury, it was enacted that bishops were to assist the judges in their respective courts. They were to prevent practices of fraud and injustice, and to do their utmost to prevent the poor being oppressed by the rich. The bishops were not to fail to appear upon the bench with the secular magistracy, that the solemnity of their character might have an influence upon the court.³ The Saxon laws enacted a fine for killing a man; but it is supposed that this comprehended manslaughter only, not wilful murder. This fine, which was called the *weregild*, was rated in proportion to the quality and condition of the person killed. In the case of the king, half the fine was to be paid to the sovereign's relations and the other half to the nation. The life of an archbishop was rated in the same proportion as that of a duke, and the fine was

¹ Milner's *Church History*, p. 467.

² Sharon Turner, vol. ii., p. 169. See also Freeman's *Norman Conquest*, vol. i., p. 57.

³ Collier, vol. i., pp. 406, 411, 414.

divided as in the last case; but probably the second moiety extended only to the province to which their spiritual or temporal power respectively extended. A bishop's life was of equal value to that of an ealdorman (earl) who governed a county, and a priest's to that of a thane.¹

Athelstan was a powerful prince, and wishing to conciliate the Anglo-Danes in Northumbria he gave his sister in marriage to the king of that province, who after a time put her away and returned to heathenism. Athelstan, roused by this insult, prepared to attack him; and the Anglo-Danes, fearful lest they should be driven from the country, formed an alliance with the king of the Scots and the Welsh prince, and likewise obtained the assistance of their brethren from the Baltic. Thus prepared they attacked Athelstan at all quarters, and after a desperate battle were completely defeated. Alfred had shared East Anglia and Northumbria with the Danes; but Athelstan after this battle had no competitor: he was sovereign of all England and received, as his father had, the homage of the Welsh and Scottish princes.²

Howel Dda, who was a Welsh prince of great renown amongst his countrymen, held a synod or national council about A.D. 940. This consisted of the bishop of St. David's and other bishops with the principal laity. The country according to the laws of this prince was divided into commots, townships, &c., and six of the chief laity were summoned out of every commot. The prince and his council, which consisted of a hundred and forty persons, assembled during Lent at Tygwyn-ar-Daf, or Whitland, in Carmarthenshire, and kept a strict fast in order to prepare themselves for the work before them. They made a careful examination of the ancient laws of the country, abolishing such as were unnecessary or injurious. A new code was established which was divided into three parts—the king's prerogative, the civil, and the criminal law. The king possessed the right of making laws with the consent of his people. He might at any time muster his subjects and conduct them to battle, but could only lead an army once a year and for no longer than six weeks out of his kingdom. He could compel his subjects to build the royal palaces, and in a great measure to maintain his household. The different manors made money payments to him; thus there were many usages which tended to make the princes opulent and to supply them with the means of displaying that hospitality for which they were conspicuous. The people, engaged in a roving and military life, had little leisure to cultivate the ground, and were in some degree in a state of poverty. The country was divided into cantreds and commots. Each cantred contained two commots; each commot twelve manors; and each manor four townships or parishes. In every commot two townships were in the king's private possession. Shipwrecks and every-

¹ Collier, vol. i., p. 415.

² Sharon Turner, vol. ii., pp. 172, 187. See also Freeman's *Norman Conquest*, vol. i., p. 59.

thing thrown up by the sea on the shore of the king's personal estate became his property; but if on the coast of a bishop, abbot, or any other lord, he had to divide them with the king. Many other privileges appertained to the crown; but on the other hand, if complaint was made that oppression had been exercised by the king or any of his substitutes, the matter was to be decided by a verdict of the country; that is a jury of fifty men, holding lands, sworn to do justice. It is evident that Wales was divided into parishes at this time, as one of the rules now laid down directed that every priest who travelled was to be taken care of at the house of the parson of the parish. At the trial of causes, or assizes, the parish priest was to go to court with twelve of the principal persons, and after divine service he was to administer an oath to the judge that he would not be influenced by favour or interest. The clergy were to be judged by a synod. After the new code had been proclaimed, and received the approbation of the public, three copies were made, and greater solemnity was added to the occasion by the bishop of St. David's threatening excommunication against all who should break these laws.

Influenced by the spirit of the age, Howel, attended by the bishops of St. David's, Bangor, and St. Asaph, and thirteen other persons of distinction, proceeded to Rome, where his new laws were solemnly ratified by the pope, after which he returned to Wales. Howel governed both South and North Wales, and few military incidents disturbed his reign of forty years. His attention to his duties and his mild government gained him the surname of Dda, or the Good, and his code of laws raised him much above the level of the rest of the Cambrian princes.¹

On the death of Howel Dda, A.D. 948, Wales was again plunged in civil war. When we compare the state of Wales at this time with that of England, we see that the Anglo-Saxons had made greater advance in civilization and settled government than their neighbours in Cambria. The disturbed state of affairs which prevailed in the latter country may partly account for this.

During this century a great change took place in the monastic life of Britain, which was brought about by the celebrated Dunstan, a native of Somersetshire, whose parents appear to have lived near Glastonbury, and so placed him under the instruction of some Irish clergy who had settled at that place.² Dunstan was born about A.D. 925, and spent his early years at court, but falling under the displeasure of the king he left the royal abode. Being a talented and ambitious man, he became a priest and a monk, travelled into France, and joined the order of the Benedictines, whose rules had long been followed in Europe, though they had not yet been introduced into Britain. These monks were so called from Benedict of Nursia, in Italy, who lived at the beginning of the sixth century; a good and pious man who desired to form a monastic order of

¹ Collier, vol. i., p. 419. Warrington's *History of Wales*, p. 161—167.

² Sharon Turner, vol. ii., p. 239.

which the manner of life should be stricter than that of monks generally. The order was instituted A.D. 529. Its members were to employ their time in prayer, reading, education of youth, and other pious and learned labours. But the followers of this celebrated man degenerated sadly from the piety of their founder. They lost sight of their peculiar religious duties, acquired immense riches, became absorbed in wordly affairs, and laboured to enlarge the power and authority of the pope.¹

Dunstan was of noble family, and his connexion again procured him admittance to the royal palace. After Athelstan's death, his brother Edmund reigned, and to this prince the Benedictine monk appears to have been appointed chaplain. A monastery was built and endowed at Glastonbury by king Edward, and Dunstan became the abbot. To this, the first Benedictine establishment known in England, Edmund granted a charter which bestowed extraordinary privileges on the abbot, who had the same power of punishing and pardoning misdemeanours within the limits of his jurisdiction as the king himself.² One of the legends related of Dunstan gives us an idea of the arts by which he obtained influence over the multitude in an ignorant and superstitious age. He was fond of working in metals, and one night the neighbourhood were alarmed by terrific howlings which seemed to proceed from his abode. In the morning they flocked to him to inquire the cause, when he told them that while he was heating his work the devil had intruded his head into his cell to tempt him; that he had seized him with his red hot tongs and that the noise they had heard was Satan roaring at the pain! The people are said to have venerated him for this exploit. They appear to have forgotten that he might easily himself have made the clamour in order to extort their wonder and admiration at his tale. His reputation continued to increase. All ages and ranks united to spread his fame,³ and he obtained great influence over the next king Edred, who was succeeded by Edwy or Edwin. This monarch gave a greater share of his favour to the married clergy than he did to the monks, which was highly displeasing to the latter. On the day of his coronation Edwin quitted the festive scene for the society of Elgiva his queen. The company being displeased at his retirement, Dunstan and a friend of his followed the king and insisted on his returning to the feast. Edwin resisted, and a scene of altercation ensued in which Dunstan, after using insulting words to Elgiva, forced his sovereign back to the assembly. This conduct was not forgiven by the youthful king, and he displayed a feeling of independence which Dunstan had not expected.⁴ Odo, archbishop of Canterbury, compelled Edwin to separate from Elgiva, under the pretext that she was too nearly related to him to be his lawful wife, and after branding her in the forehead

¹ Mosheim, vol. i., p. 405.

² Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 178. Collier, vol. i., p. 426.

³ Sharon Turner, vol. ii., p. 248.

⁴ Sharon Turner, vol. ii., p. 253.

banished her to Ireland. The king's feelings being thoroughly aroused, the monks were deprived of the abbey which he had bestowed upon them, and Dunstan was banished to Flanders; but he seems to have left a considerable party behind him. Northumbria and Mercia broke into revolt; the king, hard pressed, had only his southern dominions left him, the rest having been given by his rebellious subjects to his younger brother Edgar, who reversed Edwin's proceedings, restored the monks, and recalled Dunstan from his exile.¹

It appears that the popularity of the Benedictines, of whom Dunstan made himself the champion and the martyr, was the principal cause of Edwin's misfortunes. His youth unfitted him to contend against this priestly power; but his passions, being aroused by the cruelties practised to his queen through which her death was occasioned, hurried him into an imprudent contest with his ambitious dictators. His death, which occurred three years after the rebellion, hastened by the sorrows and calamities he had experienced, was a misfortune both to England and to Europe. It increased the power of the monastic leaders, and contributed in a great degree to their future influence, which exercised such an injurious effect in succeeding reigns.

Edgar now succeeded to the Anglo-Saxon throne. Dunstan was made bishop of Worcester, and afterwards of London. Ere long he was appointed archbishop of Canterbury, and hastened to Rome, A.D. 960, to receive the pall from pope John XII., it being the policy of the popes that all metropolitans should seek and obtain this ornament at their hands. Dunstan's determination to extend the rule of the Benedictines was aided by the king; the clergy were persecuted, the monks were honoured, and the monasteries largely increased.²

Edgar was a successful monarch. Kenneth, king of Scots, Malcolm, prince of Cumbria, and the Welsh princes having met him at Chester, took the oath of homage which he exacted from them.³ The princes of North Wales having neglected to pay the tribute due from them, Edgar enforced it, but changed it from a money payment to that of three hundred wolves' heads, as he found those animals committed great ravages on the flocks of both countries. This king gained considerable influence in North Wales. He founded a new church at Bangor, dedicated to the Virgin Mary; he confirmed the ancient privileges of that bishopric, and endowed it with gifts and lands.⁴ Edgar also subdued a part of Ireland, probably Leinster, as in one of his charters he speaks of his conquest, and of the noble city of Dublin.⁵

Dunstan with his friends the bishops of Winchester and

¹ Collier, vol. i., p. 433.

² Sharon Turner, vol. ii., p. 258—281.

³ Freeman, vol. i., p. 65, and note in same.

⁴ Collier, vol. i., p. 433. Warrington's *Wales*, p. 192—195.

⁵ Ware's *Antiquities of Ireland*, ch. iv.

Worcester were the great promoters of monasticism in Britain, and carried out as far as possible their design of ejecting the secular or parochial clergy from the monasteries and cathedrals, and setting monks in their place; but though assisted by the king they could not carry their point throughout the kingdom.¹ English monasteries before the time of Dunstan were inhabited by "secular" clergy (presbyters) who led a married or a single life as they thought fit. To the monks in these religious houses was given the title of "regular" clergy, and the two did not always work harmoniously together.

This powerful prelate exercised with a high hand his right of excommunication over even the nobles of the land, as will be seen by the following anecdote:—A certain earl had married a lady whose relationship to him, being within the prohibited degree of consanguinity, rendered their union unlawful. As he did not regard the archbishop's remonstrances, the latter placed him under excommunication. The earl dispatched agents to Rome; and the pope, being gained to his cause, wrote to Dunstan to restore him to communion. To this order Dunstan replied, "When I see the excommunicated person penitent for his fault I shall willingly obey the pope's command, but till that happens I cannot stoop to such compliance for the sake of any mortal man living." When the earl perceived that Dunstan was firm, he gave up his unlawful marriage, and was received back into the Church.²

During the reign of Edgar a dreadful pestilence raged throughout the country, but especially in London; and this calamity, as is usual in such cases, awakened men's minds to a sense of their misdeeds. It was observed that the needy and the avaricious had failed in the faithful discharge of tithes and other church dues. They were reminded that their case was similar to that of tenants failing in payments to their landowners. Men were exhorted to consider the little indulgence usually shown to such, and to ask themselves whether these failures were likely to be excused by God, when the provision for his service imposed upon them by law and conscience was fraudulently withheld. The rights of religion were now protected by civil penalties, recoverable by the ordinary processes of law. Ecclesiastical dues really require a full measure of protection; for though minds intent upon eternity are alive to the value of religious ordinances, the feelings of mankind in general too often lead them to regard expenditure upon works of piety as that which can be most agreeably and safely retrenched. Legislation against this selfishness is merciful and wise. It has secured a minister and a house of God to every part of England. In places where the wealth and population was large, these advantages might have been commanded without national aid; but the country generally must have been destitute of them, unless

¹ Collier, vol. i., pp. 436, 437.

² Collier, vol. i., p. 464.

portions of land had not only been reserved for their support, but carefully protected for that purpose.¹

Landlords founded and built churches upon their several properties, and as every estate inherited or acquired was charged with a portion reserved as the patrimony of religion, so in many if not all cases the landlords gave not only an endowment of glebe, but settled these tithes or tenths of their lands upon their Church. Thus our parochial churches have arisen not from compulsion but from the liberality of individuals during many successive generations; and these foundations can bring forward in their favour claims of two several kinds—immemorial usage, and statutes of high antiquity, together with legal surrender by proprietors, confirmatory of such usage and assenting to such statutes. It is plain that the foundation of parish churches was in steady progress during Edgar's reign.²

About A.D. 967 various ecclesiastical laws were passed at a convention held under king Edgar. One is particularly worthy of note. All persons were required to instruct their children in the Christian faith, and teach them the Lord's Prayer and the Creed, as without an acquaintance with those solemn forms persons did not "deserve the name of Christian," neither were they to be admitted to Holy Communion, or to be buried in consecrated ground.

Another canon decreed that no one was to be buried within a church excepting persons of known uprightness and religious behaviour.

The priest was forbidden to officiate without the service-book, for fear that trusting to his memory might cause him to make mistakes. From this canon it is plain a liturgy was in use.

Forms of confession follow the canons framed at this meeting, with directions for the penitent; but in this penance and devotion there is no address to the saints, nor any mention made of them, except in a petition to God that we may be admitted to the happiness of their society. The penitent makes his confession to God and his confessor, and prays to our Saviour for pardon of his sins. There is then a list of penances for different sins; and it is to be remarked that though the Lord's Prayer is enjoined to be said several times, there is not the least mention made of an Ave Maria, or a prayer to the Virgin. This shows that neither to the saints nor to the Virgin Mary were prayers addressed in the Anglo-Saxon Church in that age.³

In the earlier ages of the Church grievous offenders had been obliged to confess their guilt in the face of the congregation. They were delivered from this mortifying penalty in the fifth century by Leo the Great, who granted them permission to confess

¹ Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 190.

² Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 193.

³ Collier, vol. i., p. 438—442.

their crimes privately to a priest appointed for that purpose.¹ Hence the origin of private confession.

King Edgar made a grant of the Lothians, which formed part of the province of Northumbria, to Kenneth III., king of the Scots, on condition that he and his successors should attend the Anglo-Saxon court every year at some of the solemn festivals. To enable the king of the Scots to do this more easily, Edgar bestowed upon him certain houses upon the road as resting-places, which were possessed by the kings of Scotland till the reign of king Henry II. Possibly the Lothians were an old Pictish possession which had been conquered by the Angles. Edinburgh had been acquired by the Scottish kings some time previously, and they were doubtless desirous to add these lands to their territories.²

Edgar died A.D. 975, and during the previous year, Turketul, abbot of Croyland, who had been the king's chancellor, died, and left the monastery in possession of great riches. He caused a great bell to be cast, and the succeeding abbot caused six other large bells to be set up, to all of which he gave names, such as Bartholomew, Turketul, &c. The practice of naming bells, together with the ceremony of blessing them, was begun in this age by pope John XIV. By this they were supposed to become a defence to the building against lightning and tempest.³

¹ Mosheim, vol. i., p. 360.

² Some uncertainty exists as to the time of this cession of the Lothians. We refer our readers to Mr. Freeman's remarks in his *Norman Conquest*, vol. i., appendix i., p. 573. It is however certain that the Scottish sovereigns did homage for the ceded territory. Cumberland (that part of Strathclyde north of the Tweed so called) had been previously ceded to the Scots.

³ Collier, vol. i., p. 467.

CHAPTER XI.

CENTURIES X. AND XI.

THE DANES. CANUTE. EDWARD THE CONFESSOR. HAROLD.

EDGAR was succeeded by his son Edward, surnamed the Martyr. The clergy who had been expelled from the monasteries now claimed their right to return, saying it was a scandalous injustice to give their estates to intruders. A council was held respecting this dispute at Calne, in Wiltshire. The secular or married clergy sent for Beornelm, a Scotch bishop of great eloquence, to plead their cause. By his assistance the case was very strongly argued. The intrusion of the monks into the homes of the clergy had been much disapproved of by the more intelligent classes of the country, and the monastic party was hard pressed. Dunstan and his friends were nearly overpowered, when an accident occurred which changed the fortune of the day. The floor suddenly gave way, and most of those present fell violently into a chamber beneath. Many were killed and others severely injured. The archbishop and his friends escaped, the beam under him remaining firm. This was considered as divine evidence in favour of the monkish party and secured its triumph. It has been suggested that this was not the result of accident, but contrived by Dunstan; for opportune accidents in an age of great ignorance and superstition are naturally open to suspicion.

King Edward's life was closed by the hand of an assassin, hired by his stepmother, who thus secured her son's succession to the throne. His authority had served as a rallying point for the monastic party, and through them he has become known as the Martyr, his remains being invested with the sanctity of a saint.

His youthful successor Ethelred, known as the Unready, was crowned by Dunstan.¹ Soon after his accession the Danes landed in several places, and Ethelred purchased peace by giving them money to retire. The Anglo-Saxons were dispirited; those who still retained the ancient valour of their race being either outnumbered or betrayed by the desertion of their party. This plan of giving money rather than trusting to the sword for defence proved unfortunate to both the king and his people. The Danes returned in larger numbers; the king gave himself up either to idleness and pleasure, or to warlike attempts which failed in execution. The dissensions and quarrels amongst the nobles and great men of the kingdom, together with the rough and arbitrary character of the monarch, tended greatly to the misfortunes of this reign. Ethelred appears to have had some disputes with his neighbours in Normandy; but he afterwards

¹ Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, pp. 202, 205.

married Emma, sister to the reigning duke. The union of Ethelred with this lady, daughter of Richard the Fearless, duke of Normandy, led to the settlement of her countrymen in England. Their influence in this island now commenced, and through Emma came that kindred and friendship between her son Edward the Confessor and her great-nephew, William duke of Normandy, which suggested the enterprise that seated William on the throne of England. This foreign marriage drew the country more into the circle of European affairs; but Emma had to satisfy the insular feeling of the nation by taking a Saxon name Aelfgifu; her memory is, however, handed down by her Norman name.¹

Gwcan, a Welsh priest, was consecrated bishop of Llandaff by Dunstan. From this it has been concluded by some that all the British bishops came under the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Canterbury; but until the subjugation of Wales by king Henry I. in the twelfth century the Welsh bishops were consecrated by the bishop of St. David's, and that prelate was consecrated by the other bishops without submission to any other Church.² Llandaff from its situation towards the frontier of Wales was the first member of the ancient British Church whose independence was diminished.³

Dunstan died A.D. 989. He was a man of uncommon talents, though the monkish writers by their exaggerated tales have done much to turn him into ridicule.⁴ He had almost entirely governed England during the reigns of four of her kings. The state and power of the bishops had greatly increased during this century, for in addition to their spiritual authority they had become powerful as temporal lords. The tenure of lands in this and the succeeding centuries gave increased power to all landowners.

Many persons believed that prayers for the dead were necessary because they supposed that after death the soul of man was retained in an intermediate state, which they considered to be a place of temporary punishment previous to the final judgment. This idea concerning purgatory was taken from a pagan doctrine respecting the purification of departed souls by a certain kind of fire.⁵ It had become very general in Europe during this century though not equally so in Britain. The council of Florence put forth this doctrine authoratively in A.D. 1438; the council of Trent confirmed it in 1563; and in the creed of pope Pius IV. it was stated that "the souls there detained are aided by the suffrages of the faithful." We shall presently find that the doctrine of indulgences was connected with that of purgatory.

This is a suitable place to mention some tracts and homilies which were written towards the close of this century by arch-

¹ Collier, vol. i., p. 475. Freeman, vol. i., p. 301.

² Collier, vol. i., p. 473. Also Giraldus Cambrensis, *Itinerary*, b. ii., ch. i.

³ Soames's *History of the Reformation*, vol. i., p. 453.

⁴ Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 206.

⁵ Mosheim, vol. i., p. 348.

bishop Elfric of Canterbury or Elfric Putta of York, both of whom were men of great learning. The homilies are preserved in the Bodleian library at Oxford. The one for Easter is intended to instruct the people respecting the holy eucharist or Lord's supper, and is plainly directed against the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation. It shows how this sacrament was typified by the paschal lamb (Ex. xii. 3), and says, "Whatever there is in the eucharist which repairs our nature, and recovers us to a better life proceeds wholly from spiritual operation. . . . This sacrament is a type and earnest. . . . We are vouchsafed this pledge or earnest in a sacramental way, till we come to the truth itself. . . . The holy eucharist is the body and blood of Christ, not in a corporal, but in a spiritual meaning." Elfric in one of his letters to the clergy says, "This sacrifice of the eucharist is not our Saviour's body in which he suffered for us, nor his blood which he shed on our account; but it is made his body and blood in a spiritual way, as the manna was which fell from the sky, and the water which flowed from the rock in the wilderness." That rock from whence the water flowed was not Christ, but it was a type of Christ who said, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink." St. John vii. 37. St. Paul says the children of Israel "did all eat the same spiritual meat and did all drink the same spiritual drink." 1 Cor. x. 3, 4. The manna which supported them for forty years in the wilderness and the water which flowed from the rock were a type of the body and blood of Christ, which are now offered in the Christian Church.¹

We see by this that our Church spoke plainly through her primate against this great error, and we may remember that John Scotus Erigena wrote against it in the reign of Alfred a hundred years previously. This same archbishop of Canterbury likewise drew up some canons for the guidance of the clergy, of which the following are examples:—

Every priest before his ordination was required to be furnished with a psalter, a book of the epistles and gospels, church hymns, penitential, &c. The latter gave the penances which were to be imposed upon people for particular sins.

The parish priest was obliged on Sundays and other holidays to explain the Lord's prayer, the creed, and the gospel for the day to the people in the Anglo-Saxon tongue.

Priests were forbidden to move from one parish to another for the sake of gain, but were to continue on the cure to which they were first ordained.

The orders of the Church besides bishops had now been multiplied to seven. The office of one was to toll the bells, to open the church doors to the faithful, and close them against the excom-

¹ Collier, vol. i., p. 481—485. Collier says that it is not quite certain which of these archbishops wrote these homilies, but that their authority is unquestioned, and that their public use and reception proved that they were the doctrine of our Church at that time.

municated or the infidel. Another had to light the tapers when the gospel was read, or when the priest was going to consecrate the bread and wine. Another had to bring the chalice, &c., and another to read the lessons in church. One who was called the exorcist was to conjure evil spirits and drive them out of persons they had possessed. The deacon was to attend to the priest and lay the offerings of the congregations upon the altar.¹ The appointment of an exorcist gives us an idea of the extent to which superstition had arrived, and we observe by the mention of all these orders the great increase of ceremonial in public worship. Elfric, archbishop of Canterbury, died A.D. 1006.

The country was now miserably harassed by the Danes. At the synod of Haba, held about A.D. 1006, the priest was desired at daily prayer to offer up petitions for protection against them; and the people were directed to prostrate themselves on the ground and sing the third psalm, and the collect against the Danish invasion, and it was desired that "this be done as long as the present calamity of the times continues."

The Danes made a descent upon Scotland in the reign of Malcolm II. about A.D. 1002. This prince unlike king Ethelred fought against them and gained a great victory, in gratitude for which Malcolm founded a bishopric at the place, and gave the crown lands in the neighbourhood for its support. About this time a synod was held at Perth, where Gregory, bishop of St. Andrew's, presided, and several canons were made for the better government of the Church.²

Elphegus, or Alphage as he is also called, succeeded Elfric in the see of Canterbury. The Danes continued to harass the country, and having overrun the west entered the county of Kent and besieged Canterbury. Some of the nobles, seeing the danger they were in, begged the archbishop to provide for his safety, as his death would be a public loss; to which he replied, "God forbid that I should tarnish my character by so inglorious an action. What can I be but an hireling, if, when I see the wolf ready to devour my sheep, I presently run away and leave them?" He called the people together, and exhorted them to suffer the utmost rather than renounce their Christianity, and having given them the Holy Communion, recommended them to the divine protection. The city was taken by the Danes and terrible barbarities were committed. The archbishop pressed forward and implored the enemy not to blemish their manhood by such cruelties to women and infants. He was immediately seized, loaded with chains, and cast into prison. After some months, the principal officers of the Danish army offered him freedom if he would pay a sum of money and persuade king Ethelred to do the same, otherwise they threatened him with death. He replied that the country had been so ravaged as to be incapable of raising such an amount, and he

¹ Collier, vol. i., p. 487—490.

² Collier, vol. i., pp. 487, 492.

was not so mean as to persuade the king to a dishonourable peace. Some of his friends wished him to soften his answer and to allow them to collect money, but the noble archbishop said, "Would you have me impoverish the Church and rob the poor? No, by the grace of God, I shall never preserve my life in such a way." The savage Danes, seeing he would not yield, put him to death in a cruel manner, knocked him down with their axes and stoned him, while, like the martyr Stephen, he prayed for his enemies and recommended his Church to our Saviour's protection. Alphage was buried in London at St. Paul's, but his remains were afterwards removed to Canterbury.¹

About A.D. 1013, Sweyn, king of Denmark, arriving with a considerable fleet, struck terror into the Anglo-Saxons by his barbarities, and gained the submission of nearly the whole country, the Londoners also giving themselves up to him. Ethelred, seeing his affairs in so desperate a state, sent his queen Emma to Normandy with his two sons, and himself followed shortly afterwards. Upon the death of Sweyn, Ethelred, invited by the nobility, returned, and was received with a great welcome. He defeated Canute, the son of Sweyn, who set sail for Denmark, but returned the following year, when Ethelred had several contests with him; but none were decisive. Ethelred died in London, and the greater part of the nobility and bishops declared for Canute, and swore allegiance to him. He was a Christian, and took an oath to protect the Church and the state in their rights and privileges. The title of earl now displaced the more ancient name of ealdorman.²

Edmund Ironside, son of Ethelred, was acknowledged as king by the people of London; and, being supported by the capital city, he fought several battles with Canute with varied success. At length they agreed to a division of the kingdom; but soon afterwards Edmund was murdered, and Canute became sole monarch. Edmund left two sons, who were sent abroad; and the younger married a daughter of the king of Hungary, and had a son and two daughters. The nobleman, at whose instigation Edmund lost his life, told Canute that he had acted thus to serve him; but the king was disgusted with his conduct, and said, "Thy blood be upon thy head, for thy mouth hath condemned thee," and ordered him to be hanged for the crime.

Canute endeavoured to please his Anglo-Saxon subjects, and to make some amends for the injuries done to the Church by his countrymen. Where battles had been fought, he built chapels and made provision for priests to pray for the souls of those who had been slain. He built a church and founded an abbey at Edmundsbury, now Bury St. Edmund's, where his father Sweyn had died, and pressed the punctual payment of tithes and other church dues. When he found himself settled in the kingdom he

¹ Collier, vol. i., p. 493. Other accounts are given, but all agree in the murder of the archbishop by the Danes.

² Freeman, vol. i., p. 405.

took a journey to Rome and spent Easter with pope John XIX. About A.D. 1032, Canute granted a charter of privileges to the abbey of Glastonbury, in which mention is made of the blessed Virgin and all the other saints. The practice of immediate address to the Virgin Mary did not prevail in England till the tenth century.¹

Canute possessed many kingly qualities. In a public document addressed to the Anglo-Saxons, he says, "Be it known that I have vowed to God Almighty to . . . rule my kingdoms and people justly, and to observe equal judgment everywhere; and if through the intemperance or negligence of my youth I have done what was not just, I will endeavour hereafter by God's help to amend it." At his death he left three sons. The Danish chiefs wished his son Harold to succeed him, but the Anglo-Saxons preferred Hardicanute, who was Canute's son by Emma, the widow of Ethelred. The sons of Ethelred were not forgotten; but their party was not yet strong enough for their recall. The Danish brothers divided the kingdom; but Harold soon gained possession of the whole. On his death Hardicanute succeeded him, but died two years afterwards, by which time the Anglo-Saxons were tired of the Danish yoke, and sent to Normandy to recall the Saxon line.²

Edward, called the Confessor, son of Ethelred and Emma, now became king, A.D. 1042. He had been educated in Normandy, and had a strong liking for the manners and language of the people of that country. The court of England was soon filled with Normans. None who asked a favour in the Norman tongue were refused. The national language was banished from the court, and Norman manners and customs became the fashion.³ Two Normans, his chaplains, were raised by him to the sees of London and Dorchester; and Robert, another native of that country, became archbishop of Canterbury. These appointments caused much jealousy and discontent, and ere long the Norman prelates were forced to quit the kingdom. An Anglo-Saxon, called Stigand, was made archbishop in place of Robert, and by this fell under the displeasure of the pope; but he continued to fulfil the duties of his office notwithstanding the prohibition of Rome.⁴ The most commendable circumstance in king Edward's government was his attention to the administration of justice. He compiled a code of laws which he collected from those of Ethelbert, Ina, and Alfred. These are now lost, but they were long held in high estimation by the English nation.

About A.D. 1054, Malcolm III. of Scotland, being assisted by Edward's soldiers, regained his throne from the usurper Macbeth, who was killed in battle in 1058. Malcolm, soon after his coronation, held a council at Forfar, where many excellent laws were

¹ Collier, vol. i., p. 496—504.

² Sharon Turner.

³ Thierry's *Norman Conquest*, translated from the seventh Paris edition, by Wm. Hazlitt, esq., vol. i., p. 125.

⁴ Collier, vol. i., pp. 521, 530.

enacted. Before this time the Scotch bishops had no fixed diocese; but now certain portions of the country were assigned to each. Two new sees of Murray and Caithness were endowed by the king.¹

King Edward had no children; and when he was advancing in age, he sent to Hungary for his nephew Edward, the son of Edmund Ironside, to come with his family to Britain in order to secure their succession to the crown. Edward died soon after his arrival in London, leaving a son Edgar, called Edgar the Atheling, and a daughter Margaret, who married Malcolm III. of Scotland. Edward the Confessor had married the daughter of the earl Godwine, a nobleman whose name is celebrated in the annals of those times, who rose to power under Canute, and whose house had now reached the highest dignity which a subject house could attain. Harold, the son of Godwine, greatly distinguished himself in his campaign against the Welsh in 1063, in which he was assisted by his brother Tostig. The object was to reduce that people to submission; their king Gruffydd ab Llewelyn, having laid waste Herefordshire and destroyed the town and cathedral, offered shelter and assistance to Algar, earl of Chester, who had fallen under the displeasure of king Edward. Harold and his brother earl Tostig were thoroughly successful in chastising Gruffydd for these acts. Harold subdued the level country, put the Welsh prince to flight, and advancing into the mountainous districts succeeded in conquering the entire people, who, dispirited at the flight of their prince, submitted to the tribute they had formerly paid, and gave hostages to Harold as pledges of their future obedience. On this occasion Harold erected several pillars of stone to perpetuate the glory of having passed mountains which had hitherto formed a barrier to the Anglo-Saxon arms. The Welsh afterwards put Gruffydd ab Llewelyn to death and sent his head to Harold.²

The venerable abbey of Westminster was founded by Edward the Confessor, who pulled down the remains of the old monastery, which was rebuilt with great magnificence, and far exceeded the buildings of that age. It was dedicated with much solemnity to the service of God; the king, with the queen, archbishops, bishops, and nobility being present. This was the last public act of Edward, who fell ill and died shortly after, to the great grief of his people, who seemed to have some foreboding of approaching troubles. Notwithstanding his partiality for the Normans and the favour he showed them, he was long remembered with affection by his subjects for his humanity, justice, and piety, and was further endeared to them by his descent from a long line of native kings.³

Upon the death of Edward the Confessor, Edgar the Atheling,

¹ Collier, vol. i., p. 522.

² Warrington's *History of Wales*, p. 217—223. Freeman, vol. ii., p. 467—473.

³ Collier, vol. i., p. 525—531.

who was the heir of the Saxon line, was put forward by some as his successor, but his party was small; and Harold, son of Godwine, who was ambitious and enterprising, succeeded in obtaining the crown. There was another claimant in the person of William, duke of Normandy; but Harold, having held the government against the pretensions of Edgar Atheling, was resolved not to resign it to the more distant claim of William. We are now brought down to the period of the Norman invasion, one of the greatest epochs in our national history; but before entering upon it we must consider the condition of the country and the Church at this time.

CHAPTER XII.

CENTURY XI.

TITHES, &c. INDEPENDENCE OF THE ANGLO-SAXON CHURCH.

WE mentioned in the early part of this work that the clergy lived with the bishops in or near to the towns in which their churches were placed, and went to and fro, administering to the people as required. This practice prevailed amongst the Britons, and subsequently amongst the Anglo-Saxons. The princes and great lords of the country held a large proportion of the land. The dignity of a thane or gentleman was open to every one possessed of a certain property, but one of the qualifications of such a position was a church upon his estate.¹ The rest of the people were little better than hinds or serfs as they were called. As Christianity spread, the landed proprietors built country churches for the purpose of having a priest settled amongst them to instruct themselves and the people. These were not allowed to be built before a sufficient endowment was made for the maintenance of a priest, which usually consisted of a certain portion of land and offerings made by the tenants. All these revenues were settled upon cathedral or parochial churches with the advantage of an independent tenure, not in the nature of alms as some ignorant people pretend. We have seen in the course of this history how kings and nobles gave lands to found bishoprics, monasteries, and abbeys. The church lands were granted without any burden or reserved rent upon them, whereas all grants of estates made to laymen retained some service to be performed by the tenant: some quit-rent or mark of acknowledgment was reserved. The churches were not to be used before being consecrated by the bishop, whose approbation of the claim of a priest to officiate as well as his consent to his removal had to be obtained. The bounds of the parochial division were commonly the same as those of the estate of the founder. In some places the patrons did not build the church, but endowed the living, and the structure was erected by the priest out of the offerings and contributions of the neighbourhood. This provision of rural churches was not only carried on by the laity; but the bishops also, as they grew wealthy, built parochial churches within their manors, assigning the profits of them to their respective incumbents. The bishops as we have mentioned had their clergy with them, whom they sent as they saw occasion to those places where their services were most needed; but as the parochial churches became more numerous, this custom fell into disuse. And thus most of the inferior clergy

¹ Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 165. The word "Thegn," says Freeman. vol. i., p. 88, "became equivalent to noble or gentle."

became settled in the country, the bishops and their canons residing at the cathedral church. The parishes were again divided as converts became more numerous, and by this gradual process the present parochial division was established. In the reigns of Edgar and Canute we find the distinction of the mother-churches, to which belonged the original settlement of tithes, and of later churches built by the lords of manors, to which they could only apply a third part of the tithes. For some time these were but chapels to the old church, which reserved to herself the right of baptism and burial; but in order to encourage the building and endowing of churches and to make better provision for the people, the later foundations were gradually brought up to an equality of privileges with the former, and made distinct parishes. Before the reign of Edward the Confessor the parochial division was so far advanced that every person might be traced to the parish to which he belonged, and the distinction of parishes, as they now stand, appears to have been settled before the Norman conquest.¹

All this proves incontestably the right of the Church to her endowments, and shows that our parochial churches are the gradual fruits of the liberality of her children. There is no trace here of independent congregations; each new church as it came into existence was a member of that religious body governed by its bishops—the primitive Church of these islands.²

The date of the foundation of churches in Wales may in some degree be traced by their names, for according to popular opinion many were founded by those holy persons or saints whose names they retain. The recesses of the mountains appear to have been more populous formerly than at present; the inhabitants of Wales preferred to live where they were most secure from foreign aggression; thus the county of Carnarvon contains more churches than the larger and more fertile county of Montgomery. The word *llan* in the Welsh language applies not only to the Church, but the sacred spot which surrounds it. The word *capel* appears to have been of subsequent introduction, as it is seldom applied to the names of parochial churches; another designation is *bettws*; and though several places so named have been formed into separate benefices, there are sufficient proofs remaining to show that they were originally attached to other churches in their neighbourhood. The formation of parishes was gradual as in the sister countries, and their limits were determined by the estate of the person who endowed each church with tithes. This accounts for their unequal extent and inconvenient distribution.³

The early monasteries, to which we have alluded as centres of Church life and work, were largely endowed with lands of which we will cite some instances showing them to be the gift of individuals.

¹ Collier, vol. i., p. 542—545.

² Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 261.

³ Rees's *Welsh Saints*, pp. 11, 17, 20, 21.

The famous monastery of Glastonbury was endowed with land as early as A.D. 601, and towards the end of that century we find it was further enriched by pious individuals. The abbey of Whitby was another foundation of that century, of which the celebrated abbess Hilda was the founder. About the same time a religious house at Ely was founded by Etheldreda, wife of the king of Northumbria, and it was further endowed by king Edgar. The abbey of Evesham was endowed with large possessions A.D. 709. The abbey of Croyland, which had many benefactors, was liberally endowed by Turketul, chancellor to king Edred, about A.D. 950. The abbey of Ramsey was founded in 969, by Alwyne, earl of the east Angles; and Coventry was endowed with lands and revenues by Leofric, earl of Chester, and Godiva, his wife.¹ Many others equally ancient might be named, but these are sufficient.

The charter of Edward the Confessor granting lands to Westminster abbey has been preserved, and shows that our princes gave lands which belonged to them, and which they inherited from their ancestors. The following is an extract:—"Edward king greeteth I tell you I have given to Christ and St. Peter in Westminster that village wherein I was born . . . with all the things belonging thereunto as fully, and as largely, and as free, as it stood in mine own hand, and also as my mother Imme, upon my right of primogeniture, gave it me."

In Domesday book, which we shall presently notice, those lands which belonged to the Church are duly put down, and this is a guarantee that they were church property at that time. William I. in a letter which he wrote to the pope told him the Church of England abounded above all other churches in temporal possessions with which she had been endowed by the liberality of pious founders and princes.

Many of our parish churches are anciently indebted to the monasteries for their endowments, though the larger number were founded by private munificence. Advowson is the right of presentation to a church or ecclesiastical benefice, and he who has that right is called the patron. The lord of the manor who built a church and endowed it with glebe or land had a right of nominating, says Blackstone, "such minister as he pleased (provided he were canonically qualified) to officiate in that church of which he was the founder, endower, or patron. A parson is one that hath full possession of all the rights of a parochial church, and is so called because by his person the Church is represented. He is sometimes called the rector; but the appellation of parson is the most legal and honourable that a parish priest can enjoy."²

As to the payment of tithes, judge Blackstone says it cannot be precisely ascertained when tithes were first introduced into this country. It was possibly contemporaneous with the planting of Christianity amongst the Saxons. The first mention of them met

¹ See Hearne's *Leland*, vol. ii., and Hearne's *History of Glastonbury*.

² Blackstone's *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, vol. ii., p. 21, vol. i., p. 384.

with in any written English law is in a decree made in synod A.D. 786, wherein the payment of tithes in general is strongly enjoined. This ecclesiastical law, which at first did not bind the laity, was effectually confirmed by two kingdoms of the Saxon heptarchy in their witenagemot, consisting respectively of the kings of Northumberland and Mercia, their bishops, dukes, senators, and people.¹

Egbert, archbishop of York, who lived in the eighth century, mentions the payment of tithes in one of his canons in a manner which shows that they were paid at that time.²

Selden, who is a Puritan writer of great repute and learning, and an unwilling witness to the payment of tithes in early times, yet acknowledges that they can be proved to be in use four hundred years after the Christian era; and he gives as a reason why we may not expect to find them earlier, that Christians in the early ages of Christianity were so liberal that their bounty far exceeded what the tenth would have been; but he says in another part of his book that he was not so bold as to say no tithes were paid before the period he had named, only that it could not be proved that they were.³ He acknowledges that not only from feelings of devotion, but through ecclesiastical censures, aided by the secular power, tithes were paid A.D. 400. Selden further admits that three great fathers of the Church wrote on the subject during the fourth century. St. Jerome wrote on the neglect of paying them. St. Chrysostom does not differ from him, and speaking of the Jewish liberality in payment of tithes says that Christians should not give less. St. Ambrose teaches them to be due by God's law.⁴

The legislative enactments in Anglo-Saxon times on the subject of tithes simply gave the clergy a legal right to recover them, which without these enactments they could not do. The edicts of Ethelwulf, Alfred, Athelstan, Edgar, Canute, Edward the Confessor, and others were merely confirmatory of voluntary gifts and rights made over to the Church. Moreover, as the tithes were not and are not held by her in a corporate capacity, but are the endowments of the several parishes, which parishes were not endowed simultaneously, but gradually as churches were built and multiplied, it was impossible that there could have been one general endowment carried out as a national act.

The foundation of some of our cathedral churches and bishoprics is very ancient. First come those of York, London, and Caerleon. Bishops from those sees were present at a council in the fourth century. Llandaff was another of the very early foundations. We give the dates of some other cathedrals; and though the magnificent piles that now adorn our land were rebuilt in Norman times, the money employed for the purpose was chiefly raised from property belonging to the ancient foundations and from the alms

¹ Blackstone's *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, vol. ii., p. 25.

² Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 106

³ *The Historic of Tithes*, by J. Selden, ed. 1618, pp. 35, 36, 461.

⁴ Selden, p. 53—56, and p. 70.

and gifts of English churchmen. There is a party in the kingdom who loudly assert that the endowments of the Church were given by the state, and are, therefore, national property. It seems marvellous that such an assertion can be advanced in the face of so much evidence to the contrary. The history of our Church, which is co-eval with that of our country, extends over many hundred years, and some want the time, others the inclination to study it. There is, however, much with which churchmen should make themselves acquainted in order to meet and refute the specious arguments set forth by those who wish to deprive our ancient Church of her endowments, her churches, and her graveyards.

When a vacancy occurred by the death of an archbishop or bishop a successor was appointed by the united votes of clergy and laity, and this was the usual mode in early times throughout all Christendom. The original nomination would seem to have rested with the sovereign, subject to the approval or rejection of the above-named parties. Gradually the European sovereigns took the appointment in some degree into their own hands by confirming the elections and granting investiture of the temporalities, which began to be annexed almost universally to the episcopal dignity, and the elected bishop could neither be consecrated nor receive any secular profits without this confirmation and investiture. The popes by degrees excluded the laity from any share in these elections, and at length confined them wholly to the clergy. In Saxon times, the right of appointing to bishoprics is said to have been in the crown both in England and other European kingdoms, through the rights of confirmation and investiture. We shall find that the popes objected to the sovereign's mode of investiture, and great disputes eventually occurred respecting it; but this belongs to a later period of our history.

The bishop, when chosen, was examined before his consecration by the other bishops, as to the soundness of his belief, and gave a pledge for the due performance of his episcopal duties. He promised obedience to his metropolitan, but no mention was made of obedience to the Roman see or of a belief in the doctrine of transubstantiation. The mention of such obedience and belief in later forms of consecration affords the strongest evidence of the novelty of that claim and that doctrine. The prelates of the Anglo-Saxon Church were members of the *witena-gemot* or parliament, and on every meeting of this great national council they were provided with places. Thus an English prelate's right to his parliamentary seat has descended to him from his long line of predecessors, and is rooted amidst the very foundations of the monarchy.¹

Marriage was treated as a "holy estate," and the priest, at the ceremony, bestowed a solemn blessing, and death alone was considered to be a release from the nuptial tie. The council of

¹ Blackstone, vol. i., p. 377. Soames, p. 261.

... his wife for infidelity, but ... Women occupied an ... They were allowed to ... property: they shared ... at the witena-gemot ... liberty, and property ... was taken for the ... Ina and ... In the public office ... though the collects, ... Latin, yet after every ... translation followed. Hence ... that her devotions ... by the people. If ... namely, that every ... Lord's prayer ... have relapsed into ... on this subject ... the instruction of her

... the entire dependence of ... Augustine to the Reforma- ... of her independence ... The last which has been ... of the pope was regarded ... the case of Stigand ... in the place of the ... Edward the Confessor, and was ... The Anglo-Saxons paid no heed ... and the archbishop continued ... of the Anglo-Saxon princes paid more tribute to Rome than others did. Offa ... before he built his ... Alfred built the abbeys of Win- ... without any reference to the Romish see. Edward the Confessor at a later date, when he granted a charter to the abbey of Westminster which he had rebuilt,¹ applied to the pope for his confirmation of the same, as a place for the coronation of princes, and a mansion for the order of the Benedictines. The offerings to Rome from the Anglo-Saxon princes were truly gifts, and not in any sense tribute, as has been explained before. The Anglo-Saxon nation resisted any Romish encroachments on the independence of their Church; but we shall presently see that the Norman princes for reasons of their own were less unwilling to recognize the papal claims.

There can be little doubt that great ignorance prevailed through-

¹ Soames, p. 279, and note in the same. Sharon Turner, vol. iii., p. 66.

² Soames, p. 253, and note. Collier, vol. i., p. 505. Milner, p. 487.

³ Soames, p. 235. Collier, vol. i., p. 529.

⁴ Collier, vol. i., pp. 401, 527.

out the country: the Danish invasions and the jealousies caused by rival claimants to the throne unsettled all classes, and were most unfavourable to the growth of learning.

Missionaries from Britain had laboured amongst the northern nations, where heathenism still lingered. Christianity was introduced into Norway by the Anglo-Saxons A.D. 933, and about A.D. 1001, some English priests were sent by Ethelred to Sweden at the desire of the king. Of these, Sigefrid archdeacon of York was one; he became a bishop, and in his absence amongst some of the islands the pagan nobility cruelly murdered his nephews, whom he had left in charge of his diocese. On his return he refused, though poor, to touch the fine which had been levied on the murderers, and even prevailed on the king to spare their lives. This truly Christian bishop died at his post in Sweden. Adam of Bremen who wrote A.D. 1080, says, "Look at that ferocious nation the Danes. For a long time they have been accustomed to resound the praises of God look at that piratical people; they are now content with the fruits of their own country they now eagerly admit the preachers of the word." Towards the close of this century the northern nations ceased entirely to invade the southern.¹

The history of Wales during these centuries shows how great an amount of discord and confusion prevailed. Occasionally a Howel or a Roderic triumphed over the other chiefs, and by his superior energy and talents kept his people in subjection and ruled the country well. This, however, was the exception; and we cannot but feel surprised that amid such troublous times religion held its footing as it did, and that the Church retained her influence over the people; for notwithstanding their endless dissensions and their domestic feuds, the Welsh princes always respected the vested rights of the Church. Property in Wales descended from the father in equal proportions to the sons. Feuds constantly arose about the distribution, and might often overcame right.² There is no one but must admire the patriotic feeling which sustained the Welsh, and induced them to prolong the unequal struggle against their powerful neighbours, often subdued, yet again rising to resistance. At the same time we see how much more advantageous it had been to the country, had it merged into the kingdom of England sooner. Internal discord appears to have been the bane of the Britons; it was this that chiefly contributed to their conquest by the Saxons; and the continued struggles between the rival princes in Wales impoverished that country and caused her subjugation to English rule to become a relief and a blessing.

The papal power had been steadily increasing since the days of Charlemagne, and had advanced to an enormous extent during the tenth and eleventh centuries both in civil and religious matters. From the time of Leo IX., A.D. 1049, the popes employed every

¹ Milner, p. 485.

² Rees's *Welsh Saints*, p. 22.

method to render their dominion universal. They assumed authority to arbitrate in all controversies, aspired to unlimited jurisdiction over synods and councils, and represented themselves to be supreme rulers over the kings and princes of the earth. Before Leo IX., no pope had laid claim to this unbounded authority, or asserted the power of transferring territories and provinces from one prince to another. The arrogance and ambition of the popes were however not unopposed by France and Germany; and Britain from her insular position was enabled to preserve a great degree of independence. Many of the bishops, particularly those of the two former countries, endeavoured to maintain the rights and privileges of the Church; but others, influenced by interest or superstition yielded to these imperious pontiffs.¹ The monastic life was held in the highest esteem throughout Europe, and the Benedictine monks gained such repute that they were invited from their monasteries to the courts of kings, and placed at the head of affairs of state. The influence and power possessed by Dunstan in our own country has already been described.

¹ Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 146.

CHAPTER XIII.

CENTURY XI.

THE NORMANS. WILLIAM INVADES ENGLAND 1066, AND SUCCEEDS TO THE THRONE.

THE Danes and Norwegians had made their appearance on the coasts of Gaul before the death of Charlemagne, A.D. 804. They came in their vessels, landed, and carried off spoil and captives; they seized some of the islands, where they constructed huts and deposited their booty. Even the Mediterranean coasts were not free from their incursions. The great emperor had foreseen the trouble which these pirates would occasion, and the civil wars which ensued amongst his descendants were one of the chief causes of their success. These northmen, for they were a mixture of Swedes, Norwegians, and Danes, were called Normans by the Franks.

The ancient limits of Gaul had become much curtailed. During these civil wars and commotions several small principalities or duchies had sprung up, whose chiefs were nominally the vassals of the king of the Franks, but were really independent of him. This was especially the case during the reign of Charles the Simple, as he was aptly called, who was a contemporary of our king Alfred. In his reign a Norwegian noble, called Rolf or Rollo, who had been banished from his country, and had taken refuge in the islands of the Hebrides on the west of Scotland, arrived with his followers on the coast of France, and sailed up the Seine as far as Rouen. The inhabitants, terrified and despairing of help from Charles, surrendered at once. Rollo and his followers determined to make the city their head quarters, and to obtain possession of the surrounding country. They gained such a secure footing and carried on their encroachments so successfully, that the inhabitants at length, A.D. 912, being harassed and wearied, demanded that the war should be terminated by negotiations between king Charles and these resolute invaders. Their wishes were acceded to, and the king consented that Rollo should possess the territories he coveted, and which he had, in fact, conquered. He became duke of Normandy; and to this province Charles afterwards added Brittany, though it was at that time a free state. The condition attached to this treaty was that Rollo should become a Christian, and live in peace with the king of France, who offered him his daughter in marriage. These terms were accepted by the "sea king," and Rollo's baptism and marriage took place in the city of Rouen.

Thus was founded the dukedom of Normandy. Rollo was a wise and firm ruler; but his companions were made lords of the towns and rural districts with little attention to the previous rights

of the natives. In Normandy the mere fact of being a Norman was a title of nobility, and gave a right to liberty and power.¹

It has already been mentioned that Ethelred king of the Anglo-Saxons, who married Emma daughter of the third duke of Normandy, had found an asylum in that duchy during the victories of the Danish invader Sweyn. Edward the Confessor, son of Ethelred, had a strong affection for the country in which his early years had been passed; and his successor and brother-in-law Harold, son of Godwine earl of Kent, found a formidable rival to the English throne in William duke of Normandy.

The Normans had been settled in their adopted country for above one hundred and fifty years. They no longer spoke the Danish language, but Romaine, or Norman-French, and this finally severed the tie between themselves and the northern nations, which had been gradually weakening through lapse of time. The reception of Christianity had polished and civilized them in an extraordinary degree, and these fierce warriors, who, in their pagan state held learning in aversion, now distinguished themselves by their pursuit of knowledge and their study of religion.

The friends of duke William of Normandy alleged that Harold had sworn to assist him to obtain the English throne; but Harold asserted that the oath had been extorted from him at a time when he was in William's power. Each claimed to have been named by Edward as his successor, and both were connected with him by marriage.² Harold was determined to keep possession of the kingdom, and William of Normandy was equally bent upon obtaining it. He resolved to gain the sanction of the pope, and laid his complaint against Harold before the papal court, thus affecting the character of a plaintiff awaiting justice and desiring that his adversary should be heard. Robert, formerly archbishop of Canterbury, and a monk named Lanfranc, conducted this appeal. But Harold refused to send an ambassador to plead his cause, and declined to renounce the independence of his crown by placing the disposition of it in the hands of a foreign power. The pope to whom William appealed was Alexander II., whose chief aim was to add to the religious supremacy of Rome an universal sovereignty over the Christian states. William demanded that England should be placed under the ban of the Church, and declared the fief of that sovereign whom the pope approved. A bull of excommunication against Harold and all his followers was pronounced by the pope, and sent to William with a consecrated banner and permission to enter England in order that he might bring back that kingdom to the obedience of the holy see (as it was now called), and establish for ever the tax of Peter's pence.

William made his purpose known in the neighbouring countries, and the military adventurers of western Europe hastened to

¹ Thierry's *Norman Conquest*, vol. i., p. 91—101. See also Freeman's interesting account of the settlement in Normandy, vol. i., ch. iv.

² Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 137. Sharon Turner, vol. ii., pp. 371, 372.

Normandy, eager to join in the invasion of England and share in the booty to be acquired. The king of France declined to assist him in the undertaking; but a large force was assembled, formidable not only from their numbers, but their eagerness and the military skill of their leader. A martial spirit had at this time spread over Europe; daring enterprises were undertaken by the great nobles and their numerous followers, and amongst these haughty chiefs William had long been distinguished by his courage and address. Tostig, brother of Harold, had joined the league against his country, and induced the king of Norway to aid William by sending an expedition to England. The Norwegians, having landed in Yorkshire, were defeated by Harold; the king and Tostig were slain, and these invaders withdrew to return no more.¹ But other foes approached. The Normans had set sail for England, the duke's vessel leading the way with the pope's banner flying at the mast-head. They landed at Pevensey, near Hastings, in September, 1066, three days after Harold's victory over the Norwegians. The duke was the last to step ashore, and as he touched the ground, he slipped and fell on his face. His followers exclaimed, "This is a bad sign," but William rising, said, "My lords, what is it you say? I have seized this land with my hands, and all that it contains is ours." Harold was at York when he heard that William of Normandy had arrived and had raised his banner on the Anglo-Saxon territory. He hastened to meet his formidable enemy; but as his army, reduced by his combat with the Norwegians, was very much smaller than that of William, some of his chiefs advised him not to risk a battle, but to retreat towards London. Harold rejected their advice with disdain, and some days passed in messages between the two chiefs.

When the battle commenced, the flower of Harold's army, his personal followers, the chosen warriors of Kent, Essex, and London were ranged round the two-fold ensigns—the dragon of Wessex, and the standard, the personal ensign of the king. The Norman shout, "God help us," was answered with the national war cries of "God Almighty" and the "Holy Cross." At one time the battle seemed to be won, for the left wing of the Normans was thrown into confusion; but the heart of William never failed him, and by his presence of mind he recalled his troops. At their head he pressed towards the standard, but still the fortune of the day was undetermined. The brothers of Harold had fallen, but the standard still waved, and the king still fought beneath it. The Norman duke now ventured on a stratagem: a portion of his army feigned to retreat; but they soon turned upon the exulting enemy, who had too rashly pursued them. The Saxon troops fell into disorder, but still the combat was fierce. Harold had expressed his determination to conquer or to die, and while he lived his followers still fought and hoped. At length his career was closed: pierced by an arrow and slain by Norman lances he fell at

¹ Thierry, vol. ii., p. 156—166. Freeman's *Norman Conquest*, vol. ii., ch. xiii. xiv.

the foot of his standard. Even then resistance did not at once cease, but the battle was decided with the fall of this last of the Saxon kings.

The body of Harold lay for some time on the field of battle. His mother sent to William to ask permission to bury her son; but he refused, saying that a man who had been false to his word should have no sepulchre. Tradition, however, says that he afterwards relented, and allowed the body to be interred under a heap of stones, and eventually to be taken for burial to Waltham abbey, which Harold had founded and enriched. It was difficult to recognize his remains, so greatly had they been disfigured by his wounds.¹ These events are related by the Anglo-Saxon historians in a tone of most mournful despondency. They call the day of battle a bitter day, a day of death, a day stained with the blood of the brave.

William made a vow to build an abbey on the spot where this victory was gained. Monks from a great French convent came to settle there; the land on which the battle had taken place became the property of the abbey, and it was called in the language of the Normans *l'Abbaye de la Bataille*. It is said that when the building was commenced, the architect feared there would be a scarcity of water. "Work away," said the conqueror, "for there shall be more wine among the monks of Battle abbey, if God give me life, than there is water in the best convents of Christendom."²

After the victory William marched his army into Kent, where, it is said, he met with unexpected opposition. Stigand archbishop of Canterbury, and Egelsin abbot of St. Augustine's abbey in that city, had called the Kentish men together, pointing out to them the necessity for exertion in order to avoid the miseries that would happen to them. The tradition relates that William was met at Swanscombe wood near Gravesend by a body of these Kentish men, who contrived by a stratagem to make their numbers appear much greater than they really were, and William agreed to a parley. The archbishop was spokesman, and told the duke that they would be his subjects provided they were offered reasonable terms. They could not endure arbitrary rule, and would rather lose their lives in battle than live under oppression. Though the rest of their countrymen might stoop to servitude, liberty would be the choice of the men of Kent. William, startled at their boldness, and wishing to avoid a battle, granted their requests, and their old laws and customs were preserved to them.³ This tradition has been thus preserved in an old Kentish ballad:—

When England was invaded,
And Harold lost his crown,
And Norman William waded
Through blood to pull him down.

¹ Freeman, vol. ii., p. 473—504.

² Thierry, vol. i., p. 178.

³ Collier, vol. i., p. 552—554.

When counties round, with fear profound,
To mend their sad condition,
And lands to save base homage gave,
Brave Kent made no submission.

CHORUS.

Then sing in praise of men of Kent,
So loyal, brave, and free ;
In Britain's realm, if one surpass,
A man of Kent is he.

The hardy, stout freeholders,
That knew the tyrant near,
In girdles and on shoulders
A grove of oaks did bear ;
Whom when he saw in battle draw,
And thought how he might need them,
He turned his arms, allowed their terms,
Complete with noble freedom.

CHORUS.

Then sing in praise of men of Kent,
So loyal, brave, and free ;
In Britain's realm, if one surpass,
A man of Kent is he.

William was soon seated on the throne of England, and crowned at Westminster, by Aldred archbishop of York, when he took the usual coronation oath of the Anglo-Saxon kings to protect the Church, to administer justice, and to repress violence. After this he received the submission of the nobility, who came to swear fealty to him. Stigand archbishop of Canterbury was in no favour with his new sovereign ; partly because he had been chosen to take the place of the Norman archbishop Robert, in Edward the Confessor's reign, and partly because he possessed great influence over his countrymen, which William feared he would exercise against his interests. The conqueror perhaps owed his ultimate success as much to the want of union amongst the surviving Saxon leaders and the feeble character of Edgar, as to the valour of his followers, and his own resolute disposition. The surviving earls, prelates, and chief thanes submitted to his authority. By the battle of Hastings he had vanquished the prince elected by the Anglo-Saxons ; but their liberties were still in their own hands. These they imprudently transferred to him, by submitting to his rule without attempting to exact any conditions, in the vain hope that he would not take advantage of their generosity. At first every thing wore the appearance of tranquility. King William sought to unite his Norman followers with the Anglo-Saxons by intermarriage ; but though he made a show of friendship towards his new subjects, he was careful to place the real power in the hands of his Norman chiefs. He disarmed the inhabitants, built castles in the large towns, and bestowed the estates of the followers of Harold upon the most powerful of his own countrymen. The standard of Harold he sent to pope Alexander with a rich present.

William, six months after he ascended the throne, visited Normandy to look after his affairs in that duchy. During his absence, and after his return, various attempts were made by the Anglo-Saxon nobles to regain their power, but without success. Edgar the Atheling retired into Scotland with his sisters Margaret and Christina, where they were welcomed by Malcolm III., to whom Margaret was soon afterwards married. This union was most important in its results to both the countries concerned; through her the royal Saxon blood was united with that of the Norman princes by the marriage of her daughter with Henry I. Another English Margaret, in 1503, completed the union of the royal houses, and one hundred years later the descendants of the second Margaret succeeded to the throne of England. Meanwhile, Scotland became gradually English. The Scottish kings found that the southern portion of their dominions was the most valuable, and the Celtic part of northern Britain was a somewhat troublesome and unruly appendage to the lowland country.¹ Edgar the Atheling, who, by his royal descent, might have aspired to the English throne, became eventually a resident in the court of William I., and with him ended the male heirs of the Saxon line.

Malcolm III. of Scotland had received assistance from Edward the Confessor during his struggle with the usurper Macbeth, for which he showed his gratitude by his kindness to Edgar and other Anglo-Saxons. His naturally severe and cruel disposition was softened by the influence of Margaret, his Anglo-Saxon queen. She was possessed of a truly Christian mind, fitted to shine in the purest age. Many things are related of her piety, liberality, and humility. She built a church at Carlisle at her own expense; and through her influence with her husband was enabled to reform the manners of the kingdom of Scotland to some extent, and to introduce a better observance of the Lord's day. Margaret bestowed great care upon the education of her children, of whom three sons reigned successively, and were excellent kings. Her daughter Matilda married Henry I. of England, the youngest son of William. Malcolm was slain at Alnwick, A.D. 1093. The queen was suffering from illness at the time, and Theodoric, a monk of Durham who wrote her life, relates that when the intelligence was brought to her, she said, "I thank thee, O Lord, that in sending me so great an affliction, thou wouldest purify me from my sins. O Lord Jesus, who by thy death hast given life unto the world, deliver me from evil." She survived the news of her husband's death only a few days.²

The feudal system was introduced into England by William, who took care that the military power should remain in the hands of those who had enabled him to gain the kingdom. He divided nearly all the lands of England into baronies, which were conferred upon his principal followers on condition of certain services and

¹ Freeman, vol. iv., p. 510—512.

² Milner's *Church History*, p. 488.

payments. Those barons who held their lands immediately from the crown assigned part of them to others who were called knights, or vassals, and who paid their lord the same duty and submission in peace and war which he owed to his sovereign. As scarcely any of the Anglo-Saxons were admitted into the first rank, the few who retained any landed property were glad to be received into the second, and, under the protection of some powerful Norman, loaded themselves with vassalage for estates which they had freely inherited from their ancestors. The power conferred by the feudal system upon the great tenants of the crown was considerable; they held courts, and administered the law within their lordships like a sovereign prince, and were the guardians of their vassals while under age. Both the nobles and their vassals swore fealty to their sovereign as their liege lord; both were bound to furnish him with men and arms in case of war. In battle the knights were to give their lord their horse, if the latter was dismounted; to adhere to his side whilst fighting, and to go into captivity for him as a hostage when taken prisoner. We can see how completely William gained the control of the kingdom by this system, and what power of oppression was placed in the hands of the great nobles over the native inhabitants. Many ancient and honourable families were reduced to beggary, while they beheld the Normans masters of their possessions, and themselves excluded from every road which could lead to riches or honour.¹

The Church suffered greatly during this monarch's reign. The Anglo-Saxon sovereigns had exacted no service from the bishops and abbots in return for the lands with which they endowed their sees or monasteries; but William adopted towards them the custom which prevailed on the continent of Europe. There the bishops and heads of monasteries held lands by a feudal tenure, and were obliged like the nobility to furnish their princes with a certain number of soldiers in time of war, and were sometimes even called upon to take the field at the head of these troops. The estates of a bishop or abbot in England were now looked on as a fief, held of the king by the tenure of military service. From this principle arose the king's claim to the revenues of a vacant bishopric or abbey during the vacancy, and thus great abuses arose in the hands of an unscrupulous prince.²

The first recognized papal legate visited England about 1070. The duty of these emissaries from Rome was to take charge of the interests of the pope their master, and in every way to extend and increase the power and influence of the Roman see. William paid great honour to these representatives of his ally, pope Alexander, while he made use of them to serve his own purposes. A large council of Norman clergy and laity was held at Winchester, to which the Anglo-Saxon bishops were summoned by circulars, the haughty style of which warned them what the result of this council

¹ Hume's *History of England*, ch. iv.

² Freeman, vol. v., p. 132.

was likely to be as regarded themselves. "We," said the legates, "the ministers of the blessed apostle Peter, and authorized representatives of our lord the pope Alexander, have resolved to hold a council to seek out and uproot the evil things that pollute the vineyard of the Lord." The real meaning of this was that the new king with the assistance of the pope had resolved to get rid of all the higher clergy of the Anglo-Saxon race, and the presence of the legates gave a sort of religious appearance to this act.¹ It is uncertain if Stigand archbishop of Canterbury was present at the council; but he was there deprived of his see, for the reason assigned that he had assumed that dignity during the lifetime of the Norman Robert, who had been banished by the Anglo-Saxon people; but it is thought that his refusal to crown William was the real cause. Some historians, however, affirm that William would not be crowned by Stigand, because that prelate lay under the censure of the see of Rome, and the king did not wish to displease pope Alexander, who had encouraged his invasion of England. It is probable that the king was also glad to gratify his displeasure against Stigand, who regarded Edgar Atheling as the rightful heir to the throne. Stigand, after he was deposed from the archbishopric, was imprisoned at Winchester, where neglect and melancholy hastened his death.² Several other Anglo-Saxon prelates were deprived of their sees, and it seemed that William was resolved that no dignity, ecclesiastical, civil, or military, should be retained by any native.

Lanfranc, abbot of Caen, in Normandy, was proposed by the legates as successor to Stigand; a choice which was approved by the king, who hoped that his ability would be useful to him. It will be remembered that Lanfranc had conducted William's appeal to the pope against Harold before the Norman invasion of England took place. It was the custom of the Anglo-Saxon Church that the prelates should be elected by the general body of the clergy, and the abbots by the monks. This custom was one which could no longer be allowed, as all power was to pass from the natives to the Normans. A Norman was appointed to the archbishopric of York, and the see of Winchester was filled in a similar manner. The latter prelate intended to eject the monks from his cathedral and place secular canons in their room; and other Norman bishops had formed a similar project, but archbishop Lanfranc was a great friend to the monastic orders, and refused his consent to the plan.³ One improvement effected, however, after the arrival of the Normans was the transfer of several of the bishops' sees to more populous places; many had been founded near monasteries and in small towns. Sherborne was eventually removed to Salisbury, Selsey to Chichester, Helmam to Norwich.

The first Danish bishop of Dublin died in 1074, and was

¹ Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 18. Thierry, vol. i., p. 244.

² Collier, vol. ii., pp. 1, 10.

³ Thierry, p. 247. Collier, vol. ii., p. 11.

succeeded by Patrick, who was also a Dane, and was chosen by the people at the request of the king of Dublin. He was sent to England to be consecrated by Lanfranc, to whom he promised obedience as his ecclesiastical superior. When Patrick died in 1084, another Dane from Dublin, who had been educated at Canterbury, was consecrated by Lanfranc, and took the same oath of obedience; and on his return he took with him certain books and ornaments for his church, which had been presented to him by Lanfranc. It appears that most of the bishops of Dublin and Limerick, together with the first bishop of Waterford, were Danes, and many were sent to be consecrated at Canterbury, to which see they promised obedience.¹

Archbishop Lanfranc professed great attachment to the papal see, which feeling increased from this time amongst the higher clergy in England, especially those of Norman origin. This eventually became inconvenient and even dangerous to some of William's successors; but it was not so to him, as he maintained his arbitrary power and authority over English and Normans, clergy and laity, allowing none to dispute his will and pleasure. This was displayed in his conduct to his brother Odo, bishop of Baieux, who had accompanied him into England. William had made him earl of Kent, and on the first occasion of the king visiting Normandy, Odo was left in charge of affairs in England. His ambition being aroused, he aimed at rising higher and attaining the papacy, for which purpose he resolved upon retiring into Italy, and taking with him his treasure and a large retinue of vassals. When William heard of this, he hastened back to England, met his brother just ready to embark, stopped him, summoned his chief men and ordered them to arrest him; but none would lay hands on a bishop. The king stepped forward and seized Odo himself, and in reply to his claim that he should be tried by no person but the pope, said he did not seize him as bishop of Baieux, but as earl of Kent. He was then transported to Normandy, and imprisoned in the castle of Rouen during the remainder of William's life.²

In Cornwall, the ancient West Wales, William granted an earldom to one of his brothers, and with the exception of some lands retained by the crown, the whole county seems to have fallen to his share. A portion of the revenues of the two great Cornish churches was obtained by him at Bodmin, that of St. Germon and St. Petroc. Thus arose that great earldom, and afterwards duchy of Cornwall, which was thought too powerful to be in the hands of any but men closely allied to the royal house, and the remains of which have for ages been in the possession of the heir apparent to the crown.³ The Cornish bishopric, which has lately been established, may be more properly called a restoration

¹ Ware's *Antiquities of Ireland*, ch. xxiv., p. 65.

² Collier, vol. ii., p. 39—41.

Freeman, vol. iv., p. 169.

than a new foundation, for the see dates from very early ages—doubtless, before the coming of Augustine. The bishop of Truro has, therefore, succeeded to a diocese which has an ancient and important history. It will be remembered that Aldhelm's well-known letter to Geraint, king of Danmonia, or West Wales, about 705, brings forward the Easter question. (See ch. vii.) When Egbert had subdued the prince of West Wales, the bishop of the old Celtic church in that part was compelled to submit himself to the see of Canterbury; but it is probable that some attempt at independence was again made, as in 936 Conan made his submission to Canterbury, and was thereupon recognized as bishop of Cornwall by Athelstan. The Cornish see appears to have been fixed at Bodmin, or St. Petrocstow, which is said to have contained the shrine of St. Petroc till 981, when the northmen "harryed" the place. In 1027, Lifing, the friend of Canute, was consecrated to the see of Crediton and that of Cornwall. In 1050, Exeter took the place of Crediton, and still retained the Cornish see, to which it has been united till this ancient bishopric of the Celtic church recovered its position by the installation of Bishop Benson at Truro in 1877.

CHAPTER XIV.

CENTURY XI.

POPE GREGORY VII. (HILDEBRAND), WILLIAM II., AND ARCHBISHOP ANSELM. THE NORMAN BARONS IN WALES.

KING WILLIAM I. had sought the assistance of the pope in gaining possession of the throne of England, more with the view of thereby influencing the minds of the multitude in his favour than from his own personal reverence to the Romish see; and when firmly settled on the throne, he was one of the boldest asserters of the rights of royalty against the claims of the pontiff. Other princes resisted the papal power, neither did the bishops always submit tamely to the yoke; but, notwithstanding the efforts of prelates and princes, the popes vastly increased their power, and extended their authority and sway throughout the world. Pope Nicholas II. confirmed the Norman prince Robert Guiscard in the possession of Sicily, which he had conquered, on condition of his paying an annual tribute to the Roman see, and thus was laid the foundation of the kingdom of Naples. This pope also changed the ancient form of electing the Roman pontiff, and in the following century the right of electing the popes was confined by pope Alexander III. to the college of cardinals, excluding the nobility, the people, and the rest of the clergy from all voice in the matter. It appears that there were cardinal bishops and cardinal presbyters; the former being the seven bishops who belonged to the city of Rome; the latter the ministers of the twenty-eight churches in that city. In process of time new members were added to this college, which, though it had its rise in the eleventh century, did not acquire the authority of a legal council before the pontificate of Alexander III.¹

The famous Hildebrand, afterwards pope Gregory VII., obtained supreme ascendancy in the councils of Nicholas; the latter undertaking nothing without his direction. Hildebrand was a man of great talents, but his ambition was unbounded. Haughty, impetuous, and persevering, he aimed when he became pope at universal empire, and, daunted by no obstacles, was little restrained by religion or conscience. He not only laboured to increase the power and opulence of the Romish see, but also endeavoured to bring under his authority other sovereigns and princes and to render their dominions tributary to Rome. In some European states he usurped the rights and privileges which belonged to bishops and synods; but he was unable to establish a universal obedience to his will. He claimed a yearly tribute from the king of France, but his demand was treated with

¹ Masheim, vol. ii., p. 150—158.

contempt. His ambitious aims were attended with less success in England than in any other country; for William I. was extremely jealous of his rights as a sovereign, and when summoned by this pope to do homage for the kingdom of England, he refused, declaring that he held his kingdom of God only and his sword. The pope's demand for the arrears of the Peter-pence he however complied with. It will be remembered that this was an ancient tax granted by Ina king of the west Saxons, for the establishment and support of an English college at Rome, and called Peter-pence because it was collected on the festival of St. Peter ad Vincula. The tax was for some time applied to its original purpose, but at length the popes found means to appropriate it to themselves.¹

The insular position of England doubtless greatly favoured the nation in its resistance to papal tyranny; but Gregory VII. had acquired such immense power that William's refusal to do homage was a proof of his fearless spirit. Gregory's treatment of Henry emperor of Germany shews to what a height of arrogance he had attained. These sovereigns had for some time contested the power of the Roman see, and the disagreement had arisen to such a height that Gregory excommunicated the emperor, and absolved his subjects from their allegiance. As there was a formidable faction in the empire who sided with the pope against this prince, his friends advised him to go into Italy and implore the forgiveness of the pontiff. The unfortunate emperor crossed the Alps in the depth of winter, and arrived in February, 1077, at the castle of Canossa, where the pope at that time resided. Here he stood during three days, regardless of his dignity, barefooted, with head uncovered, and in the open air, at the entrance of the fortress. On the fourth day he was admitted to the presence of the haughty pontiff, who, with a good deal of difficulty, granted him the absolution he sought. Gregory proclaimed to every sovereign that a divine right to universal obedience belonged to the Roman pontiff, and that they held their crowns from that lawful representative of the great apostle St. Peter.² When this famous pope lay upon his death-bed, it is said that he sent for one of his favourite cardinals, and making confession declared he had very much mismanaged in his office, and, by the instigation of the devil, created a great deal of disturbance in the world. Another account of his last moments says that having hurried from Rome to Salerno, in consequence of the war that was raging between the German emperor and the king of Naples, he summoned around his death-bed the bishops and cardinals who had accompanied him, and after pronouncing forgiveness of his enemies, with the exception of the emperor, he indignantly exclaimed with his last breath, "I have loved

¹ Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 158—163.

² Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 180. *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography*, by Sir James Stephen, p. 17.

righteousness and hated iniquity, and therefore I die in exile!" This report seems more characteristic than the former of the dying moments of this most haughty and unbending prelate.¹

About 1079 William I. invaded Wales with a powerful army, probably in resentment at the inroads of the Welsh. Their princes, unable to oppose him, or alarmed by his mighty name, submitted without resistance, agreed to do him homage, and took the oath of fealty as from vassals to a superior lord. The peaceable demeanour of the Welsh caused William to lay aside his hostile intentions, and he marched with his army to St. David's, where he offered up his devotions at the shrine of that saint. We mentioned in a previous chapter that few of the British saints have been placed in the Roman calendar. The same remark may be applied to those of the Anglo-Saxons, for the hatred which the Norman clergy bore to their new countrymen extended even to their saints. Indeed, the contempt which the Norman settlers expressed for all that the conquered people respected was based, as regarded their saints, upon political considerations, since the feelings of veneration experienced in these cases by the Anglo-Saxons kept alive the spirit of discontent, and revived old memories of independence and valour. The foreign prelates with archbishop Lanfranc at their head did not delay proclaiming that the Saxon saints and martyrs were not entitled to the name.²

The language of the Normans was not understood by the majority of the people, and William, wishing to abolish the Anglo-Saxon tongue, ordered that the youth of the country should be taught French in all the schools, a practice which was continued until the fourteenth century. French was the language of the court and of all fashionable company; deeds were often drawn in it, and it was used in courts of law. The custom of setting a seal to law deeds was introduced by the Normans; each witness amongst the Anglo-Saxons used to set the figure of a golden cross or some other religious emblem to his name.³ William was passionately devoted to the chase; and not content with the woods and forests in which the Anglo-Saxon princes had pursued the sport, he formed a new hunting ground in Hampshire, a part of which still remains and retains its original title of the New Forest. For this purpose he pulled down houses, churches, and convents, expelling the inhabitants and taking possession of their land without granting any compensation. Very severe laws were made respecting the preservation of game, deer, wild boar, &c.; it is said of him by a chronicler of that time "that he loved wild beasts as though he had been their father."

Having displayed the dark side of William's character, we must now turn to a brighter trait. He invited learned men from

¹ Collier, vol. ii., p. 62. *Essays* by Sir James Stephen, p. 53.

² Warrington's *History of Wales*, p. 241. Thierry, p. 254.

³ Hume, ch. iv. Collier, vol. ii., p. 4.

Normandy and other countries to settle in England, and to him we owe the restoration of learning and the dispelling of that mental darkness which had covered the country.¹

Amongst the Anglo-Saxons, both ecclesiastical and civil causes were tried by the joint authority of the bishop, the sheriff, and the judge, who sat on the bench together. King William separated these causes; no sheriff or lay person was permitted to intermeddle with ecclesiastical affairs; and no cause which related to the government or discipline of the Church was suffered to be brought before the secular magistrate; ecclesiastics were to be tried in their own court only.²

William I. caused a work to be undertaken which will always be associated with his name. This was a survey of all the lands in the kingdom, comprising their extent, value, proprietors, and tenures. Those who were appointed to execute this business entered every particular in a register, which was completed in six years. Alfred the Great had caused a like survey to be taken, which had long been kept at Winchester, and probably served as a model in this undertaking. This register, called *Doomsday Book*, which is still preserved, is probably the most valuable piece of antiquity possessed by any nation.

We have nothing to relate of the church in Scotland in this reign beyond the fact that the bishops who were elected to her sees still came to the archbishop of York for consecration, as he continued to be their metropolitan.

William I. died A.D. 1087. His ambition was immense and little governed by humanity or justice. His spirit, though bold, was guided by prudence, and his abilities were undoubted; but his disposition was crafty and artful.³ Lanfranc outlived his friend and patron William, but died soon after him. He was a great benefactor to his diocese, and rebuilt the cathedral at Canterbury, which had been burned by the Danes in the time of the good archbishop Alphege. He was possessed of considerable learning and wrote several works, the most remarkable of which is his treatise on the Holy Communion, in which he maintained the doctrine of transubstantiation. This error had gained ground in the western Church towards the end of this century; and at a synod held under pope Leo IX. the book which John Scotus Erigena had written against it was condemned.

William was succeeded by his third son William II., surnamed Rufus, from the colour of his hair. He left the duchy of Normandy to his eldest son, Robert. William was crowned at Westminster by archbishop Lanfranc, and soon shewed himself to be more tyrannical than his father. His covetousness induced him in many instances on the death of a bishop or abbot to seize upon a part of the revenues; and in order to fill his exchequer

¹ Thierry, vol. i., p. 307. Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 137.

² Collier, vol. ii., p. 44.

³ Hume, ch. iv.

he delayed nominating successors, appropriating the income to himself.

After the death of Lanfranc, the see of Canterbury was left vacant for three years. About this time Anselm, a Norman abbot, visited England, and the bishops and other great men having complained much to William of the vacancy in the metropolitan see, requested that public prayers might be made that God would direct him to recommend a proper person for that position. The king unwillingly consented, and the bishops, with some difficulty, persuaded Anselm to draw up a form of prayer for the occasion. Soon after this the king fell sick, and his conscience accusing him of his sins towards the Church of God, he resolved to select a person to fill the see of Canterbury, and named Anselm for that office. This gave great satisfaction to all but the individual selected, who was unwilling to accept the post, and his scruples were not overcome till the king wrote to the duke of Normandy and the archbishop of Rouen to discharge him of his engagements in that country. Anselm was consecrated A.D. 1093.¹

Osmund bishop of Salisbury, who died at the close of this century, was a Norman who came to England with William I.; he governed his diocese well and was of unexceptionable character. He compiled the Sarum office or liturgy, and his reason for doing so was to bring the church services to uniformity. His liturgy was collected from Holy Scripture and valuable Church records. It was generally approved and became the standard of public devotion in almost every diocese in England, Ireland, and Wales. But after his death several things were added which were not in accordance with the bishop's original compilation.²

When the king recovered from his illness, he forgot his promises of amendment; and on Anselm pressing him to allow him to call councils in order that crimes and misdeeds should be inquired into, he replied that he would call a council when he thought fit. Anselm also told the king that, though he was the protector of the abbeys and monasteries, the estates were given to Almighty God, and ought not to be seized by him. The king did not profit by Anselm's advice, and became greatly displeased.³ That which was said of William I. applied equally to his son and successor: "The king and the chief men loved much, and overmuch, to amass gold and silver, and cared not how sinfully it was gotten so that it came into their hands."⁴

The crusades or holy wars commenced in this reign. They owe their origin to Peter the Hermit, a Frenchman, who had lately returned from a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. While he was at Jerusalem he was grieved at the state of servitude and ill usage which the Christians experienced from the Saracens, and promised

¹ Collier, vol. ii., p. 54—56, and p. 68.

² Collier, vol. ii., p. 96.

³ Collier, vol. ii., p. 73.

⁴ *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.*

the patriarch of that city that he would endeavour to interest the Christians of the west in their cause. Peter travelled through Europe exhorting all Christian princes to hasten with their followers to Jerusalem, in order to rescue the holy places from the hands of the infidels, as the followers of Mohammed were called. The zeal and earnestness with which he spoke made a deep impression on men's minds, and a large army assembled under different leaders, some of the principal of whom were a brother of Philip I., king of France, Godfrey duke of Lorraine, Raimond count of Toulouse, and others. About 800,000 men set out for Constantinople A.D. 1096, one of the principal divisions being led by Peter the Hermit; but a large part of this army was an undisciplined rabble, and never reached its destination. That portion which was headed by the great commanders arrived at the capital of the eastern empire. Godfrey of Bouillon, duke of Lorraine, and his brother Baldwin commanded a chosen body of 80,000 troops. The emperor of Constantinople was at first alarmed at the sight of these formidable armies; but his fears were dispelled when he found that they proceeded on their intended route. Jerusalem was taken after a few weeks' seige, A.D. 1097; and the city being thus rescued from the Saracens, Godfrey de Bouillon, the great leader of the crusade, was proclaimed its king. He declined the crown of gold which was offered to him, saying that "he could not bear the thoughts of wearing a crown of gold in that city, where the King of kings had been crowned with thorns." This illustrious hero governed Jerusalem with valour and prudence, and retaining a small army, permitted the rest of the troops to return to Europe. He died about a year afterwards, and was succeeded by his brother Baldwin.¹

Robert duke of Normandy mortgaged his dominions to his brother, the king of England, for a certain sum of money for three years, to enable him to provide his share of the expenses of the crusade; and William was so eager to obtain the duchy that he spared neither place or person in England to gain the required sum. When he had settled this affair to his satisfaction, he marched into Wales;² of the state of which country a slight sketch is now necessary.

The Welsh were at this time divided against each other. Some of the chiefs, having rebelled against their prince, Rhys ab Tewdwr, induced Robert Fitzhammon, a Norman baron, to assist them, and invaded the lands of Rhys, who was slain in action. Afterwards they gained possession of the county of Glamorgan, which Fitzhammon divided according to feudal ideas, reserving the principal part to himself with the lordship of the whole, and giving the rest to the Norman knights who had joined him in the adventure, to be held as fiefs under him. The Welsh chief, Einion, who had invited the assistance of the Normans in

¹ Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 121.

² Collier, vol. ii., p. 85.

the rebellion against his prince, was left by them with only the barren hills for his portion. The success of Fitzhammon raised a desire amongst the Norman nobility to obtain similar settlements in Wales. Several barons petitioned the king for leave to possess, under homage to him, the lands which they might conquer in that country. The situation of South Wales after the death of Rhys ab Tewdwr favoured the designs of these military adventurers, amongst the foremost of whom was Bernard de Newmarch, who took possession of Brecknockshire, and to gain some popularity he married Nest, a grand-daughter of Gruffydd ab Llewelyn. Roger de Montgomery, earl of Shrewsbury, did homage for a part of Cardiganshire; and Arnulph, his son, obtained the lordship of Dyfed, of which Pembrokeshire formed the principal part. Thus did the dissensions amongst the Welsh chiefs and princes pave the way for the establishment of these Norman barons in South Wales. Neither did the northern parts escape. The earl of Shrewsbury did homage for the territory of Powis; and the town and castle of Montgomery were so called by him after the name of his family. In this manner were the lords of the marches¹ established in Wales, and they were possessed of most extensive powers. The actual condition of a border country in those days was war, and the will of the commander, or martial law, was the only law possible. These border-barons play a prominent part in Welsh history from this period. Their estates were lost and recovered again and again, as the Normans or the Cymry were successful. The only tenure which could be imposed on the lords of such uncertain possessions was homage, with military service, to their sovereign. Writs issued in the king's name were of no authority in the marcher lordships; and such only were obeyed as bore the signature and the seal of the baron of the district. Matthew Paris gives an amusing anecdote relating to this privilege. In 1250, Walter de Clifford, one of these powerful nobles, was accused of having violently constrained a messenger of king Edward I. to eat the royal letters he had brought to him, seal and all; but the baron was heavily fined for his audacity. The royal contests with these marchers were very frequent; but as they were united, and could not be dispensed with, the king had generally to give way. This happened when Edward I. made inquiry into their titles to their estates "By what title?" said earl Warren, drawing his sword before the astonished men of law, "by this sword; and by it I purpose to keep possession." There were, however, duties connected with their privileges. These baronies being regarded as defences against the foragers of Wales, the barons were bound to maintain garrisons in their strongholds, and watch as well as ward. The lords of Glamorgan usually kept their exchequer and court at Cardiff castle, and each of the other lordships had a distinct jurisdiction. Some of the lords allowed the natives to enjoy such of their ancient laws

¹ An old English word, signifying boundary.

as were not contrary to those of England or injurious to their own interest. As soon as one of these Normans gained a footing in Wales, he selected a spot for a fortification; and the numerous castles whose massive ruins meet our eyes owe their origin to these barons. The submission of Wales had always been a leading object of the Normans, as a means of preventing the misery and devastation which the animosity of a warlike people occasioned on the English borders. The Norman princes found it useful thus to employ their martial and restless nobility, who selected the most fertile parts of the country on which to build castles for their residence and defence, and the towns for the accommodation of their soldiers and followers. Pembroke, Tenby, Kidwelly, Swansea, and Abergavenny may be named amongst others. Newport in Pembrokeshire was built by Martin lord of Cemaes. Many of them were ancient towns before the Norman invasion, but had been destroyed or injured in the course of time or by frequent wars. Bristol, Gloucester, Worcester, Shrewsbury, and Chester were at this time rebuilt or fortified, and formed a line of military posts upon the borders of Wales. After a time one of the Welsh princes who had been for some years in captivity made his escape; and his southern countrymen, rallying bravely round him, attacked the Normans, demolished many of their fortresses, and being joined by the people of North Wales, spread along the English borders and laid waste the adjoining counties. William Rufus, indignant that a people who had quietly submitted to his father should dare to oppose his authority, raised an army and marched into the confines of Wales. He was, however, obliged to retire, and the Normans were driven from their possessions for a time; but before the death of the king they regained their footing and practised the same tyranny over the Welsh which they had previously shewn to the Anglo-Saxons.¹ The tower of London, London bridge, and Westminster hall were built in the reign of William II., who was accidentally killed while hunting in the New Forest; he was succeeded by his brother Henry I., A.D. 1100.

The Normans were now firmly established in England. Thirty-four years had passed since the first Norman king had ascended the throne, and great changes had taken place both in Church and state. The influence of Rome was more widely felt, and the power of the popes had increased. The mild rule of the Anglo-Saxon kings was exchanged for the iron sway of the Norman princes and their haughty barons. This invasion was the last to which our island was subject; we have since been mercifully preserved from foreign foes, an inestimable blessing, as those countries which have suffered from invading armies can tell us. But though the Norman inroad caused much misery at the time, as did those of the Saxons and Danes previously, each proved eventually beneficial. The mixture of the different races has

¹ Warrington's *History of Wales*, b. v., p. 242—264. Woodward's *History of Wales*, pp. 245, 515.

made us what we are; to them we are indebted for our naval prowess, our love of enterprise, our perseverance, and our industrious habits.

This country had not interfered with the political affairs of the nations of the continent of Europe during the Anglo-Saxon rule, but it had held much friendly intercourse with France. The accession of the Norman princes, however, changed this state of things. The duke of Normandy held his duchy under the king of France, whose vassal he was; and the jealousy of the French king was naturally aroused when he became sovereign of England. Thus the possession of Normandy occasioned our being mixed up with the politics of Europe, caused many wars between England and France, and aroused much of the national hatred that arose between the two countries. But though our continental possessions entailed this disadvantage upon us, they nevertheless contributed to the increase of our commerce, and to our importance amongst the other nations of Europe.

We have dwelt somewhat largely upon the early history of our Church in these islands for several reasons. It is comparatively but little known to the general reader, and we wished to show the origin of the Church's title to the property which she possesses. We have shown that, whenever the first converts to Christianity founded a church, they freely bestowed land and tithe, that this continued to be the case till the whole country was one Christian community, dioceses and parishes were formed, and the whole rule of our Church was settled. The gifts were those of princes, or of private individuals of their own free will; not in any way, manner, or form, a gift from the state in any of these islands. Laws were passed as government became more settled amongst the Anglo-Saxons, in order to secure to the Church her possessions, and to enable her ministers to claim their dues if defrauded. This gave the state no more claim to the property of the Church than similar laws passed in the present day do to the property of private individuals.

We also wished to bring prominently before our readers the fact that our Church was planted in these islands in apostolic times or soon afterwards, that her bishops attended the early councils of the Church, that she existed and increased in Britain till the Saxon invasion, and was flourishing in Wales, Ireland, and the south-western part of Scotland at the time of Augustine's arrival, A.D. 597; and after his arrival, though missionaries from Rome helped through Augustine to evangelize some of the Anglo-Saxon settlements, their conversion to Christianity was brought about mainly by members of the early native churches of these islands.

We have shewn that the British Church retained its independence of Rome, and a comparative freedom from Romish errors up to the time of the Norman invasion. We shall pass more quickly over the next few centuries, until the Reformation dawns upon us, merely noticing the principal events of interest, and those characters who shed light upon the dark times of papal supre-

macy, superstition, and error, which followed the Norman rule in England and Wales; for during those ages there were not wanting princes and people who strove manfully against the usurpations and encroachments of Rome. "In England," says Mr. Freeman, "a purely national Church arose." It is true that the Latin tongue was employed in public worship, a natural but grievous error, arising from the fact that when Latin was the universal language of the west, it had occurred to no man to translate the Latin service into the languages which were growing up in its place. Thus the western nations were deprived of the use of the Scriptures and the church services in their own tongue. England, however, soon began to form a literature in her own language, both sacred and profane, and the English Church, reverencing but not bowing down to Rome, infused her influence into all the feelings and habits of the English people. The independent Anglo-Saxon Church had by the end of the seventh century become a bright light in the Christian firmament.¹ In later times the purity of our religion was dimmed by Roman influence; but its lustre was restored and the link remained unbroken which united and still unites the Anglican communion with the early British and Saxon churches of these islands.

¹ Freeman, vol. i., pp. 31, 32.

CHAPTER XV.

CENTURY XII.

HENRY I. A.D. 1100. THE FLEMINGS IN PEMBROKESHIRE. HENRY I.
AND ARCHBISHOP THOMAS A BECKET.

HENRY I., who succeeded A.D. 1100, was not the rightful heir to the throne of England; his elder brother, Robert, returned from the Holy Land to Normandy about a month after the death of William Rufus, and prepared to assert his claim to the crown, while Henry, being sensible of the weakness of his title, resolved by fair profession to gain the affections of the people. Archbishop Anselm was not in England when William II. died, having gone to Rome to lay his complaints against that sovereign before the pope. He was recalled by Henry, who proposed that he should do homage to him, as he had previously done to his brother. Anselm, however, had acquired other ideas on this subject during his visit to Rome, and absolutely refused to do so. Henry, feeling his position still insecure, did not insist further at that time, but requested that the affair should remain undecided. The king at his coronation not only took the usual oath, but granted a charter which was calculated to relieve his subjects from many of the oppressions of which they had complained during the two former reigns. He lodged a copy of it in some abbey in each county; but when it had served his purpose by raising his popularity, he never thought of observing a single article.¹

With the view of gaining still more the favour of the English, who clung with affection to the memory of their native princes, Henry married Matilda, a niece of the Saxon prince Edgar Atheling. This princess was a daughter of Malcolm III., king of Scotland, by his wife Margaret, and had been brought to England on the death of her parents. She had been educated by an aunt in a nunnery, whither, like many Anglo-Saxon ladies of the higher classes, she had retired for protection from the Norman soldiers. She does not appear to have forgotten the lessons of piety and mercy she had then learned; and it is probably to her influence that the king owed the few redeeming qualities he possessed. She advocated the cause of the oppressed, and when at a later period the king, in consequence of disputes with archbishop Anselm, seized a portion of his income, queen Matilda pleaded with him for her husband thus, "Though the king, acts as one who is powerful rather than as a just judge, yet I beg you to put aside all bitterness against him; nay, rather pray to God for him, for me, and for our little ones, and for the prosperity of the kingdom." Other things are recorded, which show this

¹ Hume, ch. vi.

princess to have been a worthy daughter of Margaret, the Anglo-Saxon queen of Scotland.¹

Robert, duke of Normandy, landed in England, and Henry feeling apprehensive for his life and crown, paid great court to the archbishop, whose authority over the people and influence with the barons was of the utmost service to him. An arrangement was made between the royal brothers, and it was agreed that Robert should resign his claim to England on receipt of a certain payment, and that the adherents of each should be pardoned and restored to their possessions, whether in Normandy or in England. This promise was soon broken by Henry, and the weakness of his brother's character caused such discontent in his duchy, that it afforded Henry a pretext for invading Normandy. Robert was taken prisoner, and remained during the rest of his life in confinement in Cardiff castle.

The subject of investitures now caused many disputes, in Europe. The investiture of bishops and abbots was instituted when grants of land were made to them by the European sovereigns and princes. According to the laws of the period—laws which in this and other countries are still in force—they were required to take the oath of allegiance to their respective sovereigns. But the custom of investing them with the ring and crozier was of a much later date, and was introduced when sovereigns assumed the power of conferring bishoprics and abbeys at their own selection, instead of, as formerly, by the election of the clergy and people. The crozier, or pastoral staff, formed like a shepherd's crook, was meant as an emblem of the duties of the chief shepherd of the flock. It is uncertain by what prince the ceremony of investing with the ring and crozier was introduced. The popes opposed the innovation, as they disapproved of the ensigns of spiritual authority being conferred at the hands of laymen, and Gregory VII. had enacted a severe law against it.² When Henry I. required Anselm to do homage to him, he also desired him to consecrate the bishops whom he had thus invested. Anselm replied that he could not do so, as the pope had decided that those who allowed the claim of lay investitures were to be excommunicated, and he should thus draw down that sentence upon himself. The archbishop's deference to the pope in this matter caused a serious quarrel between him and the king. Henry told him that he would not give up the liberties of his kingdom for any pope, while Anselm considered that he owed obedience to Rome in things pertaining to his Church. In a letter which the king sent to the pope, he told the pontiff that he had better moderate himself towards him, "lest ye compel me (which I shall do against my will) to recede, and depart utterly from your obedience." After many disputes, the pope came to a compromise with the king; and though he did not yield the point of investitures, he consented that the bishops and abbots should do

¹ Churton's *Early English Church*, ch. xvi., p. 302.

² Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 172.

homage for their lands as temporal lords did. The king was pleased with this, and all differences being made up, Anselm, who had been absent, returned to England and was received with great cordiality.¹

Shortly after Henry came to the throne, the archbishop of Vienne arrived in England with a commission from the pope as legate over the whole island. This was looked upon as an usurpation never before heard of, and he was not allowed to exercise that character. Thus we see that the English Church stood upon its ancient right; for, although the pope's legates had visited the island before, they had always come for some special purpose.

Thomas, archbishop of York, who had crowned king Henry, rebuilt the cathedral of that city and furnished it with a good library. He divided the diocese into archdeaconries, and instituted the office of dean. His learning was considerable, and he was skilful both in vocal and instrumental music.²

Archbishop Anselm died about nine years after Henry I. became king. It is said of him that the native English loved him as if he had been one of themselves.³ It has been observed that good men often appear to more advantage in private than in public life, and this is especially applicable to the archbishop. In public all that is generally known shows him to have been a great supporter of the pope's power in England; but when we reflect on the shameless and profane conduct of the Norman princes, we can believe him to have been guided by pure motives, however mistaken in this part of his conduct. His zeal against the luxury and vices of the rich was most praiseworthy, but he used his influence in support of that pernicious rule, the celibacy of the clergy. If we set aside his attachment to the papal authority, and his belief in the superstitions of the times, his character stands high as a divine and a Christian. The following sentences from his directions for the visitation of the sick show his firm trust in the merits of his Saviour:—"Dost thou believe that thou canst be saved only by the death of Christ? See that whilst life remains thou repose all thy confidence in his death; trust in nothing else; place the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between you and your sins." The following prayer displays his faith and humility:—"See Lord, before thee is my heart, it struggles, but can do nothing of itself. Do thou what it cannot do. I ask, I seek, I knock. Thou causest me to ask, cause me to receive. Thou givest me to seek, give me to find. Thou teachest me to knock, open to me knocking." The upright course of life and conversation of this prelate preserved some remains of true religion in the nation.

Alexander, king of Scots, when he succeeded to the throne, wrote to Anselm for some help and directions as to his conduct. The archbishop told him the way to be happy was to make the law

¹ Fox's *Acts and Monuments of the Church*, folio, vol. i., p. 217. Collier, vol. ii., p. 127.

² Collier, vol. ii., pp. 103, 105.

³ Thierry, vol. i., p. 347.

of God the measure of his actions; to give religion and justice the highest place; that a prince was absolute in the best sense when he reigned over his passions—that his conduct should be such as to make him beloved by the best, and dreaded by the worst of his subjects, always remembering that there will be a remarkable distinction between virtue and vice in the other world.¹

Wales continued to be the scene of feuds, hostilities, and jealousies, as one prince or another was taken into the favour of the English king. The dissensions between the rival chieftains of the country hastened the termination of its independence and destroyed slowly but surely its union and its strength. A great number of Flemings had fled into England during the reign of Henry I. in consequence of terrible inundations in their own country. Gilbert de Clare count d'Eu, a Norman by birth, with an army of Normans and Flemings, conquered the Welsh province of Dyfed, or Pembroke; they entered this territory with the leave of Henry, and Gilbert, called by his Fleming and English followers Strongbow, was created earl of Pembroke. Some of the native English took part in this expedition, and their language became the common tongue of the vanquished district, whence it expelled the Welsh idiom; a circumstance which gave to that part of Pembrokeshire the name of Little England beyond Wales. A road along the crest of the hills, which was made by the conquerors, in order to secure more rapid communication, retained for several centuries the name of the Fleming's way.²

A further colony of Flemings was sent by Henry II. to join their countrymen, and to this day the descendants of these colonists in the southern part of the county of Pembroke are plainly to be distinguished from the native Welsh by language and customs. The castles that meet the traveller's eye in almost every town in Wales bear witness to the subjugation of the country. Encouraged by the example of Strongbow, other Norman adventurers landed in Cardigan bay, one of whom Martin de Tours, assumed the title of lord of Cemaes, the name of that part of the country in which they established themselves. To sanctify his invasion, Martin built a church and priory at St. Dogmael's, in Pembrokeshire, on the banks of the Tivy, and is said to have been buried there: the ruins of this abbey are still visible.³

Giraldus Cambrensis, an author of this century, speaks of the national love of music amongst the Welsh. There was a harp in every house, and stanzas were sung, often extempore. The same writer says that the Welsh were gifted with great volubility of tongue, and much confidence in answering before princes and nobles. The Norman barons, who had obtained possession of so many portions of South Wales, dispossessed the native clergy and planted Normans in their stead, excusing their conduct by declaring

¹ Milner, p. 489. Collier, vol. ii., p. 132.

² Thierry, vol. ii., p. 17.

³ Giraldus Cambrensis, *Itinerary through Wales*, p. 425, note in ditto. Thierry, vol. ii., p. 19.

the clergy to be heretics. The Welsh complained to the pope, who paid no heed to them. They, therefore, expelled the intruders whenever it was possible to do so: for to receive the sacraments of the Church from a foreigner and an enemy was an insupportable affliction.¹ The see of St. David's had hitherto been independent, but in the reign of Henry I., we find that Bernard, the queen's chaplain, was consecrated bishop of that ancient see, and took a vow of obedience to the archbishop of Canterbury,² which, however, he afterwards retracted, and claimed independence.

Anselm's successor as archbishop of Canterbury was Ralph, bishop of Rochester, who was nominated by the king at the desire of the other prelates. The pope did not approve of this selection, because, as he stated, it had been arranged without first acquainting him; but in consideration of the worthiness of the person, he said he would pass over the presumption. Thus we find the papal see pursuing its system of encroachment on the liberty and independence of our Church, and asserting a claim which had never been allowed. In his letter to the king the pope expressed his surprise at so little respect being paid to him, for neither nuncio or letter could make way in England without his majesty's permission, neither were any appeals or recourse for justice made from thence to the apostolic see; but all this he had borne in hopes that the king would put a stop to it. He afterwards reminded the king of the Peter-pence, which he said were ill-collected; however, he spoke of them as bounty money, given for St. Peter's sake, and not as a tribute from the English crown. Doubtless, the stand which archbishop Anselm had made against the king, and his appeals to the pope, had caused the latter to believe he possessed more power over the English Church than was really the case. The court of Rome frequently dispatched agents into England, but the king would allow no one to act as legate but the archbishop of Canterbury.

In another letter addressed to the king, the pope complained of his want of information respecting the English bishops, of his not being consulted, and of the English Church holding councils on her own authority, and bishops being translated from one see to another without application to Rome, which liberty, he said, was altogether unwarrantable, and if they persisted in this obstinacy, he should look on them as revolters, and consign them to the divine vengeance, but in case due reference was paid to the apostolic see he would treat them as sons and oblige them with any favours which were proper. This remarkable letter proves that the English prelates held councils and managed the discipline and government of the Church within themselves, and that in case of contest the matter was determined without recourse to foreign authority. The king upon receiving this letter summoned the bishops for their advice, and the prelates in Normandy having also incurred the displeasure

¹ Giraldus's *Description of Wales*, ch. x. and ch. xv. Thierry, vol. ii., pp. 19, 93.

² Collier, vol. ii., p. 166.

of the pope, it was thought best to send the bishop of Exeter to Rome, as he was well known there, and he so far succeeded in his negotiations that the pope dropped some of his pretensions, leaving to the English the election of their own bishops, and so matters were arranged.¹

King Henry died 1135, and should have been succeeded by his daughter Matilda, who had been married to Henry IV., emperor of Germany; but his nephew Stephen, son of the count de Blois usurped the throne, and civil war ensued. The manner in which Stephen had obtained the crown, obliged him to grant immense privileges to the clergy and nobility, in order to conciliate their good will. The see of Rome made further encroachments upon England during this king's reign, and appeals to the pope which had always been prohibited by the English laws became very common in every ecclesiastical dispute.² Stephen's troubled reign ended A.D. 1154, when he was succeeded by Henry II., surnamed Plantagenet, grandson of king Henry I.

The worship of the Virgin Mary had been for some time gradually making progress in Europe, and some writers place the introduction of the rosary and crown about this period, others name an earlier date. The rosary consists of fifteen repetitions of Paternosters or the Lord's Prayer and a hundred and fifty Ave-Marias (or salutations of the blessed Virgin), and the crown consists of other numbers of the same forms. During the twelfth century this veneration had risen to such a height that the "immaculate conception" of the Virgin was brought forward as a means of increasing her dignity, and about 1138, a solemn festival was instituted in honour of this dogma. It had hitherto been the universal belief of the Church that the Virgin Mary like all mortals was "conceived in sin," and that Jesus Christ alone was conceived without sin. This difference was frequently pointed out by the early writers of the Church, but as the Virgin was gradually raised to the office of a mediator, no honour was thought too great to be paid to her, and the belief that she was conceived without sin was now put forward. It is not known with certainty by whose authority this festival in her honour was first established, but the doctrine of the immaculate conception has now been made a rule of faith in the Romish Church. Relics were powerfully attracting the confidence of the people, and the practice of the intercession of saints had greatly increased; for they were regarded as mediators between the penitent and God, by those who were forgetful of St. Paul's precept,³ "There is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." 1 Tim. ii. 5.

The zeal of the Roman pontiffs for introducing uniformity of worship may be justified; but their refusal to permit each nation to celebrate divine worship in their mother tongue cannot be

¹ Collier, vol. ii., p. 158—166.

² Hume, ch. vii.

Mosheim, vol. ii., pp. 115, 290, 309.

excused. Whilst the Latin language was in general use amongst the western nations there was no reason why it should not be employed in public worship. But when the Roman empire declined, and its language, which was no longer spoken in the western provinces, had by degrees become extinct, it became just and right that each people should serve God in the language they understood. But this reasoning had no influence, and the popes could not be persuaded to change the custom, but persisted in retaining the use of the Latin language in divine service. It is this custom which is alluded to and condemned in the twenty-fourth article of our Church.

Henry II. made choice of Thomas à Becket to fill the see of Canterbury, and a slight sketch of this remarkable man is necessary. Becket was of Anglo-Saxon origin, and was induced by Thibaut, archbishop of Canterbury, to take holy orders, and was afterwards made archdeacon of Canterbury. He became a great favourite of king Henry, who promoted him to the high office of chancellor of England, keeper of the great seal. This seal had for device three lions, the emblem of legal power since the conquest. The appointment of chancellor raised Becket to a very high rank in the council; he supervised and sealed all writs and precepts in the king's court and exchequer. Thus elevated in dignity above all the Normans in England, he affected to surpass them in pomp and luxury; and as Henry had attached large revenues to the offices he held, he lived in princely state. When Becket was consecrated archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 1162, he immediately laid aside his grandeur and rich apparel, becoming the friend of the poor, and espousing the cause of the Anglo-Saxons of every rank, who hailed him as a powerful protector. He returned the great seal to the king, who, besides being irritated at this, was much displeased with the claim which the archbishop made to property that had formerly belonged to the see of Canterbury, and had been taken from it at the time of the Norman conquest. The claim was just, but those who were now in possession objected to restoring the property to the Church.¹

William I. had granted great privileges to the Norman clergy, which Henry II. wished to recall, as they had made an ill use of their power. The king wished to take from the ecclesiastics the privilege which William had granted them of not being tried by secular judges; he required that all who transgressed the laws should be tried in the king's courts, and receive the same punishment, whether laymen or cleric. To this Becket objected, excepting for a second offence, when he agreed that the offending ecclesiastic should be delivered up to the king's justices and be tried by the civil power.² The king was resolved to carry his point, and finally summoned his lords spiritual and temporal to

¹ Thierry, vol. ii., p. 53—62.

² Collier, vol. ii., p. 268.

meet at Clarendon. The laws then passed, which were called the constitutions of Clarendon, and were signed by the laity as well as the clergy, caused the final rupture between the king and his former friend the archbishop. Many of these laws were framed with the view of doing justice to both clergy and laity, without the interference of any foreign power. Canon three states that the clergy, when charged with an offence and summoned before the judge, shall be obliged to make their appearance and plead; likewise to answer in the ecclesiastical court, provided the king's justice shall send an officer to inspect the proceedings.

The fourth canon states that no archbishop, bishop, or other clergy shall be allowed to leave the kingdom without consent of the crown, and when they have permission to do so they shall give security not to act or solicit any thing during their stay, to the prejudice of the king or kingdom.

The seventh canon declares that no person holding under the king or any of his barons shall be excommunicated, nor shall any of their lands be put under an interdict before application is made to the king, if he is in the kingdom; and if he is out of England, the judge must be acquainted with the dispute.

The eighth canon for the regulation of appeals decrees that if the archbishop fails in doing justice, recourse may be had to the king; but the controversy was to be determined in the archbishop's court by ecclesiastical judges, thus showing that the cause was not taken out of the hands of the Church. The last clause of this canon forbids any further proceeding without the king's leave, which is a plain prohibition of appeals to the pope.

The twelfth canon declares that when any archbishopric, bishopric, abbey, or priory of royal foundation becomes vacant, the profits are to be paid into the exchequer, as if they were the lands of the crown. And when the vacancy is to be filled up, the king is to summon the most considerable persons of the cathedral chapter (or clergy) to court, and the election is to be made in the chapel royal with the consent of the king. And the person elected shall before his consecration do homage to the king as his liege lord.

The thirteenth canon states that if any of the temporal lords or great men shall encroach on the rights or property of any archbishop, bishop, or archdeacon, and refuse to give satisfaction, the king shall do justice to the party aggrieved.

The fourteenth canon guards against the abuse of the privilege of sanctuary by those guilty of felony or treason.

Sixteen canons were passed at Clarendon, of which all but six were declared null and void by the pope.

Becket was much dissatisfied with these laws, which caused a violent dispute between him and the king. He appealed to pope Alexander III., and thought it safer to retire into France, whence he proceeded to Rome; and the pope, after hearing his appeal, promised to espouse his cause. Henry was greatly incensed, and caused several articles to be drawn up and published against the pope and the archbishop, in one of which it was directed that if

any person brought letters from the pope importing an interdict, he was to be tried and punished as a traitor to the king and kingdom. All appeals to the pope were strictly prohibited, and no ecclesiastic was to be permitted to leave England without a passport from the judges, or to return without permission of the king. No messages were to be conveyed to the pope or the archbishop, and any subjects, whether clergy or laymen, who obeyed any interdict were to be banished the kingdom. It was also directed that the Peter-pence should be no longer sent to the pope but paid into the exchequer, and disposed of as the king thought fit.¹

The sentence of interdict, which is here referred to, was a powerful instrument of vengeance employed by the see of Rome. All the public religious services were suspended in any country to which the interdict was applied; the church furniture, ornaments, and relics were covered up and laid on the ground; the use of bells ceased, and they were even removed from the steeples; no religious rite was allowed to the laity excepting baptism to new born infants, and the Holy Communion to the dying. The rite of marriage was celebrated in the churchyard, not in the church, and the dead were not allowed burial in consecrated ground, but were interred in fields or ditches. The interdict was one of the pope's most mighty weapons, and was dreaded by the inhabitants of the country to which it was applied. The description we have given of it shows the height which the papal power had attained when such means could be employed or submitted to.

Though the king acted with such a high hand, he was in great fear of an interdict, as he well knew the effect it would produce upon the minds of his people. The archbishop wrote to Henry and reminded him how faithfully he had served him as chancellor; he observed that the Church of God consisted of two orders, the clergy and the laity, that the government of the Church is entrusted to the first, and the management of secular affairs to the second; that he ought not to direct the censures of the Church, or to force the clergy to make their appearance in secular courts. After other observations and arguments he requested the king's permission to return to his see. Becket wrote also to his suffragans, sharply reproving them for not taking his "part against the evil-doers," and declaring against the constitutions (of Clarendon), especially that in which it is laid down that there shall be no appeals to the apostolic see without leave from the king. These letters did not advance the cause of the archbishop, nor did they make any impression upon his sovereign. We cannot enter into all the disputes between Henry and Becket. After six years' absence he returned to England, but he had no sooner reached Canterbury than fresh disputes arose. Complaints were made to the king who was in Normandy, upon which he expressed himself with much warmth against the archbishop, and employed words which those

¹ Collier, vol. ii., pp. 271, 290.

around him interpreted as conveying a desire that some one would rid him of that prelate. Whereupon four gentlemen of his court crossed to England, went to Canterbury, and entering the cathedral where the archbishop was performing divine service, basely assassinated him within the sacred edifice. He met his death with great courage, but the assassins, fearing they had gone too far, did not return to Normandy, but retired into Yorkshire, where they were shunned by the people.¹

This occurrence threw the king into great consternation and made an immense sensation in Europe. Henry beheld with dismay a prospect of excommunication and interdict; he sent an embassy to the pope declaring his innocence in the matter, and offered to submit the whole affair to his decision. The pope flattered by this submission, and warned by the trouble which Henry's high spirit had hitherto given him, forbore proceeding to extremities, as he felt he should gain more by shewing leniency.

The body of Becket was placed in a magnificent shrine in the cathedral of Canterbury; he was canonized as a martyr, and marvellous miracles were said to be wrought at his tomb. Rich presents were sent and pilgrimages made from all parts of Christendom to this shrine to obtain the intercession of the saint in heaven. In one year it was computed that more than a hundred thousand pilgrims arrived at Canterbury.

¹ Collier, vol. ii., p. 291—318.

CHAPTER XVI.

CENTURY XII.

HENRY II. IN IRELAND. GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS. THE ORDERS OF ST. JOHN AND THE TEMPLARS. THE VAUDOIS.

IN the early part of the reign of Henry II., Adrian IV., who was by birth an Englishman named Nicholas Breakspear, became pope. The king sent to offer his congratulations on the event, and at the same time expressed his wish to conquer Ireland, in order to bring that people to a better belief and practice, and desired the pope's consent to that design. Adrian, in his reply, gave Henry his full consent, in order that he might enlarge the borders of the Church and improve the natives, provided that the rights of the Church were preserved, and the Peter-pence duly paid. He added that all Christian lands of right belong to St. Peter, and are under the jurisdiction of the holy Roman Church.¹

The course of events in Ireland assisted Henry's designs. That country was divided into five principalities or kingdoms—Leinster, Munster, Ulster, Connaught, and Meath. The Danes still retained possession of some parts, and the native princes were always engaged in warring with one another, or with them. About A.D. 1167, Dermot, king of Leinster, having lost his possessions, fled to England and sought the assistance of Henry II., who granted permission to any of his subjects to aid him. Dermot communicated with Richard Strongbow, earl of Pembroke, who agreed to bring soldiers to Ireland on condition of his receiving Eva, the daughter of Dermot, in marriage, with the succession to his kingdom. Other Anglo-Norman barons from South Wales went to the assistance of Dermot. Strongbow sailed from Milford Haven and, after gaining a victory near Waterford, he was married to Eva and declared the heir of Dermot's possessions. Henry, becoming jealous of Strongbow, prepared to enter Ireland with an army; but the earl making over to him what he had acquired by right of his wife, the king conferred on him the province of Leinster to be held from the crown. Henry embarked at Milford Haven A.D. 1172, and landed at Waterford where Strongbow did homage to him. The Irish princes submitted themselves to Henry, and acknowledged him as their supreme lord; all of which was accomplished without bloodshed. He made a progress through the island receiving the homage of his new subjects, and left most of the Irish princes or chieftains in possession of their ancient territories, bestowing some lands on the English. Strongbow he made seneschal or governor of the country.²

¹ Collier, vol. ii., p. 256.

² Sir J. Ware's *Annals of Ireland*, p. 1. Hume, ch. ix.

A synod was held at Cashel by command of the king, at which the bishop of Lismore acted as the pope's legate. Before the Danish invasion the Irish Church had considerable possessions, and the island was rich in colleges, bishops' sees, and religious houses; but the ravages of these invaders, which commenced in the ninth century, changed this state of things. The Church suffered grievously; there was a decay of religion, learning, and manners. The bishop's lands were seized by the chieftains, and the mass of the people were held in a state of abject subjection. The Danish invaders, after they were converted to Christianity, introduced in the tenth century the Benedictine order of monks, and one of the Danish princes who reigned in Dublin about 1038 established a see there, and made one of his countrymen its first bishop. The Danish bishops declined to place themselves under the jurisdiction of the primate of Armagh, who was metropolitan of the ancient Irish Church. This probably arose from the usual custom of invaders, who naturally look with no friendly eye upon the original inhabitants; and, from a desire to connect themselves with their Norman friends in England, they sent their bishops to Canterbury for consecration. Lanfranc, who was then archbishop, took advantage of this circumstance to advance the cause of the Romish Church in Ireland, and accompanied the consecration of Patrick, the second bishop of Dublin, in 1074, with a letter of advice as to some customs which he desired him to correct. Patrick promised obedience in all things relating to the Christian religion, which promise might be more properly expressed in all things relating to the Romish Church. At the end of the eleventh century Giselbert was admitted as papal legate; he was at the same time bishop of Limerick; and in a tract written by him he states his desire that those diverse and "schismatical" orders, wherewith Ireland is deluded, may give place to one catholic and "Roman" office. Archbishop Anselm advised that a council should be held to regulate ecclesiastical affairs, which was done in 1111, when decrees were passed, to which, however, only a part of the episcopal order consented. Political motives assisted the new order of things, though the Irish bishops and clergy resented the unreasonable length to which the changes were carried, and the prospect of their Church being dependent on the Roman pontiff.¹

At the synod of Cashel, the archbishops of Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam were present, together with many bishops, abbots, and other clergy. The decrees of the synod were subscribed by the prelates and confirmed by royal authority. The last decree directed that the offices of the church should be henceforth celebrated in every part of Ireland according to the forms in use in England; for as by divine providence Ireland had received her lord and king from England, she should also submit to a

¹ Dean Murray's *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, p. 90—99.

reformation from the same source. The primate of Armagh was not present, but he afterwards gave his assent to all these matters.¹

Doubtless the Church in Ireland required some reform, for the unhappy state of war and confusion, which had so long prevailed in that country, had caused a decay of learning and piety, and she could no longer be called the "school of the west;" but the Church in England had unfortunately now lost its purity, and this so called Irish reformation was carried on according to those Romish practices and doctrines which had corrupted our early Church.

As the Irish submitted so quickly to the English sovereignty, it would appear that they had become weary of their internal discord and of the dominion of the Danes, who held many of the cities and much of the surrounding country. The fact of Henry II. being one of the most noted princes of his time might render them more willing to become his subjects.

Henry now went into Normandy to clear himself before the pope's legate of any connivance in the murder of the archbishop of Canterbury. He took an oath that he had neither commanded nor desired the death of Becket; but as the passion he had shewn might have encouraged that act, he was willing to give satisfaction. He therefore consented that free application should be made to the pope in ecclesiastical causes, and swore to renounce and resign all those customs which had been practised in his time to the prejudice of the Church. Thus the constitutions of Clarendon² were repealed, and the murder of the archbishop occasioned Henry's submission to the encroachments of the papal power in England. The king, on his return, went to Canterbury and walked barefoot to Becket's tomb, where he remained for a considerable time without any refreshment and even submitted to the discipline of scourging.

A few years after the death of Becket, the clergy of St. David's chose for their bishop, subject to the approval of the king, Gerald de Barri, otherwise called Giraldus Cambrensis, of Norman blood on his father's side, and Welsh on that of his mother, and connected through the latter with Rhys ab Tudor, prince of South Wales. His mixed lineage guided their choice, as they knew that Henry would not allow a Cambrian of pure blood to succeed to the government of the ancient diocese of St. David's. But they did not escape the displeasure of Henry at this appointment: he sent for the principal clergy and required them forthwith to elect a Norman monk named Peter, which, from their fear of the king, they did. In due time Peter reached St. David's with a large retinue of servants and relations, amongst whom he distributed Church lands in his diocese. But he made himself so hateful

¹ Giraldus Cambrensis, *Conquest of Ireland*, b. i., ch. xxxiv.

² Collier, vol. ii., p. 336.

to the people that, in spite of their risk of displeasing the king, they drove him from them after having endured him for eight years.¹

The power of the popes was now increasing to an enormous extent, and their arrogance was insupportable. Frederick I., surnamed Barbarossa, emperor of Germany, attempted to reduce the power and opulence of the pontiffs and clergy within narrower limits. When the emperor was crowned at Rome, A.D. 1155, pope Adrian IV., required him to perform the office of equerry and hold the stirrup for his holiness to mount. This was indignantly refused, and other contests of a more important nature followed. Pope Alexander III. deposed the emperor in council, A.D. 1167, dissolved the oath of obedience which his subjects had taken, and exhorted them to rebel against him. The emperor took up arms and met with various success; but at length, dejected with the difficulties he encountered, he made a treaty of peace with his haughty and powerful opponent. This pope maintained the pretended rights of the Roman see, not only by force of arms, but by artifice and dexterity. In the third council of the lateran, held A.D. 1179, it was decided that the election of the pontiffs should be vested in the cardinals alone, and that the person, in whose favour two-thirds of the cardinals voted, should be considered the lawful and duly elected pontiff. It is, therefore, from the time of Pope Alexander III., as we have before stated, that this form of election dates. Alexander assumed and exercised the power of creating new kingdoms. In 1179 he conferred the title of king upon Alphonso I., duke of Portugal.²

During the year 1187 Baldwin, archbishop of Canterbury, made a visitation in Wales, and celebrated mass in all the cathedrals, which had never been done by any of his predecessors.³ This word 'mass' is now generally applied to the Lord's supper as administered in the Romish Church, but the word is the same with the ancient Latin word 'missa,' which was a general name for every part of divine service.⁴

King Henry's successes in Ireland were followed by victories over William, king of Scotland, who did homage to him, and it was further agreed that the bishops, abbots, and clergy should take an oath of allegiance, and that the Church of Scotland should pay deference and submission to the Church of England, as had been the case in the reigns of Henry's predecessors. To this the Scotch prelates afterwards objected, and their submission to the archbishopric of York, which dated from the earliest times, was disapproved of, now that the two kingdoms were on less friendly terms. Not long afterwards William, king of Scotland, sent an embassy to pope Clement III., who granted him a bull to put the Church of Scotland under the immediate protection of the see

¹ Thierry, vol. ii., p. 113.

² Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 268.

³ Collier, vol. ii., p. 380.

⁴ Note in Archdeacon Beren's *History of the Prayer Book*, p. 26.

of Rome. This was done in order to make the Scottish prelates independent of the Church of England and the ancient jurisdiction of the see of York.¹

Henry II. was considered one of the greatest princes of his time, in talent, power, and the extent of his dominions. He made a firm stand against the usurpations of Rome in civil affairs, but in spiritual matters he was compelled to give way. His children, who gave him much trouble, rebelled against his authority. When he found that his favourite son, John, had also been in arms against him, his spirit was quite broken, and he fell into a lingering fever, of which he died A.D. 1189. His son Richard I., surnamed Cœur de Lion, or the lion-hearted, succeeded to the throne.

Three generations had passed since the time when the Normans, under William I., had arrived in England. The possessors of the lands which had been torn from their Saxon owners were now Englishmen born, and firmly settled in those possessions. The Normans had been distinguished by their love of learning and were more polished than the other European nations; Britain had, therefore, attained the benefit of these circumstances in the improvements which had resulted in literature, the arts, and law. At the same time the invaders had introduced a much greater regard for the authority of the pope and the rules of the Romish see, not only as concerned the government of the Church, but in matters of belief. Their reform of the Anglo-Saxon Church consisted in making it as similar as possible to that of Rome, while respect for, and obedience to, the papal decrees had greatly increased amongst the clergy. The submission of the barons or great lords to their sovereign was much diminished by the feudal system; these lordly vassals no longer required the help of the crown to enable them to keep possession of the territories they had acquired; they rather wished to enjoy more liberty and to restrain their sovereign's authority. They were now thoroughly mingled with the old inhabitants, who clung with affectionate remembrance to the milder and more equal government of their Anglo-Saxon princes; and these feelings served to extend the spirit of liberty amongst both nobles and people.²

Richard I., soon after he ascended the throne, prepared for a crusade to the Holy Land, as Jerusalem had fallen into the hands of the Saracens. Money was required for this expedition, which he obtained by the sale of some of the crown lands and of the highest offices of the state; he also obtained sums of money as forfeits from those who repented of their vow to join the crusade, and his subjects were much oppressed by the various extortions made. It was not superstition or a strong religious fervour, but a love of military glory that caused Richard's mind to be so bent on this expedition. He sold the vassalage of Scotland for the small sum of 10,000 marks. In spite of the king's zeal for this religious

¹ Collier, vol. ii., pp. 345, 381.

² See Hume, ch. ix.

war, his conduct showed so little sanctity that he was advised by a zealous preacher of the crusades to get rid of his vices—namely, his pride, avarice, and voluptuousness, which he called the king's three favourite daughters. "You counsel well," replied Richard, "and I hereby dispose of the first to the knights Templars, of the second to the Benedictines, and of the third to my prelates."

Richard, who performed great exploits, and displayed undaunted courage during his stay in the Holy Land, was taken prisoner on his return, by Leopold, duke of Austria, with whom he had had a feud during the crusades. Henry VI., emperor of Germany, summoned Leopold, as his vassal, to transfer his prisoner to him, and then required from Richard a large ransom for his release. John, the king's brother, had endeavoured to gain possession of the English crown, and to draw the people of Normandy from their allegiance during Richard's absence and captivity; and in these attempts he was assisted by the king of France, who, when he heard of Richard's release, sent this short letter to John, "Take care of yourself; the devil is let loose." Richard generously forgave his brother at the intercession of their mother, and said, "I hope I shall as easily forget his offences as he will forget my pardon." The crusade in which Richard took part, exhausted England, France, and Germany, without doing any good to the Christians in the Holy Land.

Richard became involved in disputes with Innocent III., who sent various bulls to England. In one, dated 1197, the pope said it was not fit that any man should be vested with authority who did not revere and obey the holy see. In another bull he stated that he would not endure the least contempt of himself or of God, whose place he held on earth, but would punish every disobedience without delay and without respect of persons. Richard, although named the 'lion-hearted,' gave up his opposition, and thus the Romish see gained further power in England. Innocent III., as we shall presently find, acquired an authority in this country which was nearly despotic.¹

During the eleventh and twelfth centuries two orders of knights were founded, and became celebrated in history. The earliest of the two combined the religious and military professions, and was called the knights Hospitallers, or knights of St. John, taking that name from a hospital in the city of Jerusalem dedicated to St. John the Baptist. Some say the hospital was dedicated to St. John the Almoner, patriarch of Alexandria, who about two hundred years before had sent relief to the Christians resident at Jerusalem, when that city fell into the hands of the Mohammedan conquerors; but when the order assumed its more imposing military character, the name of St. John the Baptist was adopted. The hospital was founded about A.D. 1040 by some merchants of Amalfi, in southern Italy, who obtained a spot for the purpose from the Mohammedans in Syria, and was built in order to afford a sanctuary for the Christian

¹ Milner, p. 529.

pilgrims to the holy city. Attached to the hospital was a chapel, and for the first sixty years the pious and charitable brethren of St. John were occupied in relieving the stranger and the sick. When Jerusalem was wrested from the Turks, A.D. 1099, and Godfrey de Bouillon set up a Christian kingdom, the devotion of the brethren attracted the attention of the new king and his followers, and large donations were added to their funds; so that they had far more than sufficient to supply the wants of the pilgrims and the sick, and the rulers of the society proposed that they should add to their other duties that of taking service in the field against their Mohammedan enemies. This offer was accepted by the king, and the brotherhood, who had hitherto been occupied in works of charity and mercy, were now transformed into a valiant and hardy band of warriors. The order was divided into three classes, the knights or soldiers of illustrious birth, the priests who officiated in the church that belonged to the order, and the serving brethren or soldiers of low degree. This celebrated order gave very eminent proofs of valour and resolution, and acquired great wealth by their heroism. They had homes in every country in Europe, and a commandery, or religious house, was endowed, A.D. 1130, for their use at Clerkenwell in London, which was called the hospital of St. John, and was noted for its beauty and grandeur. The order was suppressed in England in 1559. When Palestine was lost to the Christians, they passed into the island of Cyprus, and thence to Rhodes, where they remained for a long time; but, being driven away by the Turks after their conquest of Constantinople in the fifteenth century, in spite of a most heroic defence, they received a home from the emperor Charles V. in Malta. Hence they have been also known in history by the name of the knights of Rhodes and the knights of Malta. They maintained the Christian cause against the Turks in many a hard-fought engagement. In 1798 Malta was betrayed to the French under Napoleon Buonaparte by the grand master of the order, and after an existence of nearly 800 years the order of St. John has become extinct.

The second order referred to was that of the knights Templars, which was founded A.D. 1118. The name was taken from the home which Baldwin king of Jerusalem assigned to them close to the temple in that city. Their duties were to protect and defend the Christian pilgrims in their passage through the Holy Land, and they afterwards became a very strong and valiant body of troops and formidable foes to the Mohammedans. They wore over their armour a white mantle on which was sewn a cross of red cloth, from which circumstance they are often spoken of as 'red-cross knights.' Men of the highest rank entered the order, which acquired great military renown, and rose to a vast height of wealth and popularity. Like the order of St. John, it had settlements in England, and in the reign of king Henry II., says an old writer, "that house, which still retaineth the name of the Temple in Fleet-street, was erected by them, and the church built according to

the form of the temple at Jerusalem."¹ When the Christian cause declined in the Holy Land, the knights of the Temple fought gallantly, and in the final struggle with the Mohammedan power at Acre, A.D. 1291, the grand master and his companions dared their utmost in defence of this last Christian stronghold. The arrogance and luxury of these knights rose, however, to such a height that, when they returned to their homes or preceptories in Europe, the existence of the order drew rapidly to a close. Their vices had awakened powerful enemies, and at last their privileges were revoked, and their order suppressed under circumstances of extreme infamy and severity by a decree of pope Clement V. at a council held A.D. 1311 at Vienne, in France.²

The luxury and avarice of many of the higher ranks of the clergy and monks gave rise to the introduction of a custom which led to the greatest scandal—that of the sale of indulgences—by which persons were enabled to purchase for a sum of money the remission of the penance or penalties imposed upon them for their transgressions. Those of the clergy who were not qualified to grant indulgences carried about the bodies or relics of saints in solemn procession, and permitted the multitude on payment of fees to touch these remains, which were supposed to possess virtues of various kinds. To such an extent had superstition blinded the people. The Roman pontiffs, perceiving how profitable this traffic was, limited the power of the superior clergy in this respect, and assumed it almost entirely themselves. They devoted the money thus raised to the encouragement of the crusades, and after a time, not content with remitting the penalties which transgressors against the civil or ecclesiastical law had incurred, they impiously usurped the authority which belongs to God alone, and pretended to abolish by these indulgences the punishment of a future life. Such a state of things destroyed the credit and restraints of penance and let the reins loose to every kind of vice. Another doctrine was now invented which is referred to in the 14th article of our Church as “works of supererogation.” This doctrine declared that there existed a treasure or store of good works, composed of the pious deeds which saints had done beyond what was necessary for their salvation, which might, therefore, be applied to the benefit of others; that the guardian of this treasure was the pope, and that he might give to such as he thought proper a portion of this inexhaustible source of merit, suitable to the measure of their guilt and sufficient to deliver them from their due meed of punishment. As we proceed with our history, the scandal caused by this doctrine and by the system of indulgences will become more strongly developed.³

When we consider the state of religion in Europe at this period, and the vices and luxury of the popes and many other ecclesiastics,

¹ Stow's *Survey of London*.

² Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 243. For this account of these orders we are also indebted to a sketch in the *Parish Magazine* for 1873, edited by the Rev. J. Erskine Clarke, M.A.

³ Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 291.

it is not surprising that there appeared from time to time men who were filled with the most earnest desire to reform the Church and restore Christianity to its primitive purity. Their knowledge was not, however, equal to their zeal; the greater part were destitute of learning and imperfectly acquainted with the Holy Scriptures, and thus unfit for the difficult task of reformation. While they shunned the errors and abuses they saw around them, they fell into others which were equally inconsistent with true religion. Of the sects which were produced in this century none were more distinguished than the Waldenses, so named from their founder Peter Waldus, an opulent merchant of Lyons. Peter caused the four gospels to be translated from Latin into French about 1160, and on perusing these sacred books he saw that the religion taught by the Roman Church greatly differed from that of Christ and his apostles. He abandoned his mercantile pursuits, distributed his riches amongst the poor, and formed an association with other pious men to instruct the multitude and teach pure doctrine.¹ Other writers claim a more ancient origin for the Waldenses, who were also called Vaudois, a name derived from their valleys in Piedmont, which in their language are called 'vaux.' They encountered cruel and continual persecution, but maintained the purity and simplicity of their religion; neither fire nor sword could damp their zeal or entirely ruin their cause.

¹ Mosheim, vol. ii., pp. 212, 219, and note in the same.

CHAPTER XVII.

CENTURY XIII.

JOHN. ARCHBISHOP LANGTON. THE INTERDICT. THE MENDICANT FRIARS.

JOHN succeeded his brother Richard I. A.D. 1199. In the beginning of his reign the Norman bishop of St. David's, who had been driven from his see by the Welsh, died; whereupon the canons of that cathedral a second time elected Giraldus to fill the vacant bishopric. King John, being greatly displeased, desired the archbishop of Canterbury to declare the election null and void. Giraldus denied the supremacy of Canterbury, and declared that his Church had from the earliest times been free and metropolitan. Such, in fact, had been the case previous to the conquest of Pembrokeshire in the reign of Henry I., when one of the first acts of Norman authority had been to abolish this privilege, in order to place a restraint upon the Welsh.

Giraldus appealed to the pope, but gained nothing by this step, and eventually the case was decided against him. The chapter of St. David's was induced by fear and bribes to desert his cause and acknowledge the supremacy of Canterbury. Giraldus then gave up public affairs and devoted himself to literature. A slight sketch of this celebrated writer may be interesting. The family of de Barri were lords of the castle of Manorbeer, near Tenby. William de Barri married Angharad, daughter of Gerald de Windsor, castellan of Pembroke, by Nest, daughter of Rhys ab Tudor; Gerald, or Giraldus, was their youngest son, and it is probable that his connection through his mother with some of the most influential Welsh families stood in the way of his advancement to the bishopric of St. David's. He was born at the castle of Manorbeer about the year 1146; from his desire to obtain the principal Welsh see, he refused the lesser ones of Bangor and Llandaff. He died about 1223, and was buried in the cathedral of St. David's. His memory was dear to the natives of Cambria, who highly appreciated his assertion of independence; and at the court of Llewelyn, prince of North Wales, a bard took his harp and thus celebrated the devotion of Giraldus to the cause of St. David's and the Welsh nation, "So long as our land shall endure, let his noble daring be commemorated by the pens of those who write and the lips of those who sing."¹

It will be remembered that after the Norman conquest the sovereign nominated bishops to their sees; but now another change took place, and they were often chosen by the chapter, which

¹ Thierry, vol. ii., p. 115. Also preface to the *Historical Works of Giraldus*, by Thomas Wright, M.A.

consisted of the canons and other dignitaries connected with the cathedral church or minster. Canons were instituted in the eighth century, and rules for their conduct were drawn up under the direction of the emperor Charlemagne at the council of Aix-la-Chapelle, A.D. 817. They were a kind of middle order between the monks and secular or parochial clergy; but as they gradually became corrupted in manners, other rules were drawn up for their direction by pope Nicholas II., A.D. 1059. All the canons were not, however, placed on the same footing, and some, following the exhortations of Ivo, bishop of Chartres, lived in a more austere manner resembling the monastic orders, which caused the distinction between the secular and regular canons, the former following the rule of Nicholas II., the latter the directions of Ivo. The regular canons employed their time in the instruction of youth and in many ecclesiastical duties; they rose in credit and reputation and received many rich donations, which occasioned much jealousy between them and the monastic orders. The first priory of regular canons in England was erected in Yorkshire during the reign of Henry I., by whom they were greatly favoured; and when Carlisle was converted into an episcopal see, regular canons were settled there who had the privilege of choosing their first bishop.¹ In the reign of William I. the Norman clergy were desirous of ejecting the monks from the cathedrals and of supplying their places by secular canons, but they did not succeed in consequence of the opposition of Lanfranc archbishop of Canterbury. In the reign of Henry I., however, they were more successful. Thomas archbishop of York settled a prebend upon the canons of his cathedral, and gradually the canons took the place of monks in all the cathedral churches.²

Geoffrey, John's elder brother, had left a son, Arthur duke of Brittany, who was the rightful heir to the English throne. The barons in that duchy and in other portions of John's dominions in France declared for the young prince in preference to his uncle. Philip Augustus, king of France, also supported his cause. Arthur was, however, taken prisoner by John, and afterwards placed in close confinement in the castle of Rouen in Normandy, where he is generally supposed to have been murdered by his uncle; it is certain that he disappeared and was never more heard of. This circumstance caused the king to be hated by many of the nobility, and the French monarch, using it as a pretext to seize the English dominions upon the continent, gained possession of Brittany and Normandy. John found himself despised by all his subjects for his many crimes, and upon the death of the archbishop of Canterbury he became likewise embroiled with his clergy and the pope.

Richard archbishop of Canterbury had complained to the pope, during the reign of Henry II., that discipline in the monasteries was almost at an end. When these establishments became richly

¹ Mosheim, vol. ii., pp. 27, 195, 280. Collier, vol. ii., p. 209.

² Collier, vol. ii., p. 106.

endowed and governed by abbots of rank, they objected to be under the control of their bishops and obtained authority from Rome to be under the direct jurisdiction of the pope. The archbishop stated that the monks spent their time in idleness, and gave themselves up to evil doings, caring little for the discipline of their houses provided they could live well and follow their own pleasure. This exemption of the monasteries from their bishop's authority increased the influence of the popes in England, and furnished them with a set of dependents who espoused the papal cause.¹

On the see of Canterbury becoming vacant, the monks prepared to choose a successor; but as they did not agree, pope Innocent III. desired them to elect Stephen Langton, a cardinal priest and an Englishman. This was done A.D. 1207; and, though the monks hesitated, the pope insisted on their obedience; but foreseeing that king John would be offended, he sent him a present and a ceremonious letter informing him of the election. John was highly indignant and sent a military force to Canterbury to drive the offending monks from the kingdom; they retired to Flanders, and the king desired some of the monks of St. Augustine's in Canterbury to take their place. He wrote an angry letter to pope Innocent, who employed the bishops of London, Ely, and Worcester in the vain task of reconciling the king to this encroachment on his authority, while at the same time they were desired to inform him that, if he did not give satisfaction to the pope, the kingdom would be placed under an interdict. John swore that, if such was done, he would seize the estates of the Church and send clergy and bishops out of the kingdom. These bishops, however, executed the pope's commission, and put the whole kingdom under an interdict, but at the same time avoided the king's wrath by escaping out of England. The interdict was generally obeyed, and John revenged himself by seizing the revenues of the bishoprics and abbeys. Some of the prelates, who did not obey the interdict and put a stop to divine service, had their effects restored to them. Pope Innocent now desired the three above-named bishops to excommunicate the king. They were too prudent, however, to return to England, but sent the pope's bull of excommunication to the bishops there; and although they did not dare to execute the sentence publicly, it soon became known.²

An excommunicated person was considered not only to have forfeited all the rights of a citizen, but even the common claims and privileges of humanity, and his society was avoided by all. Matters having reached this point, Geoffrey, archdeacon of Norwich, one of the barons of the exchequer, told the rest of the board that it was not safe for churchmen to serve an excommunicated prince, and then retired to Norwich. The king sent persons to seize the archdeacon, who was put in irons and experienced such cruel treatment that he soon died. An attempt was made by two nuncios

¹ Collier, vol. ii., p. 355.

² Collier, vol. ii., p. 415.

from the pope to settle the differences between him and the king, but it failed, and the people were thereupon absolved from their obedience to their sovereign by the papal legate Pandulphus. The pope pronounced John deposed, and urged Philip Augustus, king of France, to undertake the conquest of England, writing to most of the nobility and military men in Europe to enlist under the French king and revenge the quarrel of the Church. Philip commenced his preparations, but the pope had previously given his legate a copy of articles by which, if John signed it, the quarrel might be ended and the king restored. John consented to see Pandulphus, who, exaggerating the preparations that were being made by Philip and the discontent of the English people, advised the king to make his peace with the pope and so retrieve his affairs. Becoming alarmed at his position, he reflected that he had been five years under an excommunication, and feared that his subjects might desert him if the French king invaded the country. He, therefore, consented to the proposals of the nuncios and permitted Stephen Langton and the other English prelates to return home without disturbance, promising to make full restitution of whatever had been taken from the clergy. John then resigned his crowns of England and Ireland to the pope, and agreed to hold them from him, to do homage as his vassal, and to pay a thousand marks yearly as a tribute.¹ The legate returned to France and desired Philip to disband his army; for as the king of England had given satisfaction to the pope, he could do nothing against him without offending his holiness. Philip was not a little disgusted at this conduct, and replied that having undertaken the business at the pope's request and spent money in the preparations, he would not have dropped the design had he not been deserted by one of his allies.

King John intended to attack France, but his nobility declined to attend him till the excommunication was taken off. He, therefore, hastened the return of the archbishop of Canterbury and the prelates and clergy whom he had exiled, and on their joining him at Winchester he implored their compassion. They received him with respect and absolved him in the cathedral from his excommunication, when he swore to maintain the Church and clergy, to revive the good laws of the constitution, particularly those of Edward the Confessor, and to give his subjects the benefit of law and justice, instead of treating them in an arbitrary manner as heretofore.²

John's character, equally odious and contemptible in private as in public life, rendered him hated and despised by nobles and people. The barons had entered into a confederacy for the purpose of obtaining greater freedom for themselves and their vassals, and received much assistance from the archbishop of Canterbury, who concurred in their views. At a private meeting of some of the leading barons, which was held in London, he shewed them

¹ A mark was 13s. 4d. of our present money.

² Collier, vol. ii., p. 423.

of any evil customs that required redress. The barons left the tower and the city of London in the custody of the archbishop of Canterbury, until all the articles of the charter were executed. Innocent, still taking part with the king, excommunicated the barons and placed the city of London under an interdict; but the bull which he sent with these censures was neither published by the bishops nor regarded by the barons. The citizens of London treated it with contempt, saying that the pope had no business to concern himself with secular matters, and to shew their disregard of his censures they rang the bells all over the city.¹

John, though he had appeared to submit to the demands of the barons, strove to avoid their execution, and obtained the aid of foreign soldiers, for which they were unprepared. The country became miserably harassed, and the barons, who had so nobly held out for their own and their countrymen's liberty, were reduced to extremity and applied to the king of France for help. Innocent sent his legate to forbid the French king to enter England, as he said it belonged to him, king John being his vassal. The king of France replied that no king could give his kingdom away without the consent of his barons, and that the contrary assertion was destructive to liberty and would make the nobility slaves. Fortunately for England, death released the country from the grasp of this tyrannical and unworthy sovereign. He died A.D. 1216. His character is a mixture of cowardice, cruelty, and treachery. As a son, a brother, an uncle, or a king, it is difficult to say in which relation John appears worst.² Normandy was lost to the English crown in this reign.

The Irish rebelled against John about the middle of his reign, the reason assigned being the heavy amount of taxes laid upon them to aid the king in his war with France. The lord justice seems to have been very tyrannical and oppressive. John entered Ireland with an army, and, having brought about peace, ordered that English laws should be carried out in that country. John Comyn, archbishop of Dublin, died 1212. He was an Englishman, and chosen by the clergy of Dublin in 1181 on the recommendation of king Henry II. He built the cathedral of St. Patrick, and was a prelate of considerable learning.³

John Scot, bishop of Dunkeld, died at the commencement of this reign. An Englishman by birth, he had been chosen bishop of St. Andrew's by the monks of that place contrary to the desire of the king of Scotland, who wished his favourite chaplain to succeed, and directed the monks to make a new choice. Bishop Scot appealed to Rome for redress, and as the king paid no heed to the pope's remonstrances, the kingdom was threatened with an interdict. The bishop was unwilling that the country should suffer on his account, and eventually matters were arranged and he became

¹ Collier, vol. ii., p. 446.

² Hume, ch. xi.

³ Sir J. Ware's *Annals of Ireland*, p. 42. Collier, vol. ii., p. 431.

bishop of Dunkeld. At this time the county of Argyle was part of that diocese, where, as the people spoke only the Irish language, the bishop could not make himself understood. He, therefore, begged that the see might be divided and that his chaplain, who could speak Irish, should be made bishop of Argyle, which was done. The motives which made bishop Scot act thus are greatly to his credit. He said he could not give a satisfactory account at the last day if he pretended to teach those who did not understand him, that the income was enough for two if they were not prodigal, and that it was better to lessen the charge and increase the number of labourers in the Lord's vineyard.¹

The power of the popedom may be considered to have been at its greatest height in England during the pontificate of Innocent III. (1198—1215). At that time papal imposition and plunder prevailed in England. Throughout this century the popes virtually nominated the bishops, and by degrees put their own nominees into the best benefices. By this means Italian priests drew out of the country a sum greater, it is computed, than the whole revenue of the crown. In many cases they did not reside in England, or even appoint substitutes, but let their flock do as well as they could without almsgiving or hospitality, or preaching or any cure of souls. From the time of Boniface VIII. (1294) the power of the Church of Rome began to decline, though very gradually at first.

At the fourth lateran council, held in Rome 1215, which was attended by bishops, abbots, and ambassadors from almost all the European princes, Innocent III. caused decrees to be published by which not only the authority and power of the popes were confirmed, but new articles of faith were imposed on the Christian world. Hitherto, notwithstanding the disputes concerning the manner in which the body and blood of Christ were present in the eucharist, each Christian had enjoyed the liberty "of interpreting this presence in the manner he thought most agreeable to Scripture;"² but Innocent III., at this council, made it an article of faith that the very body and blood of our Saviour, as born of the blessed Virgin, is present in the elements of bread and wine after consecration. But though Innocent took upon himself to make transubstantiation the doctrine of the Latin or western Church, many called it in question, who, though acknowledging a real presence in the Holy Sacrament, considered it as a spiritual presence, quite different to that now set forth. Innocent also declared auricular confession to be of divine authority. Before this period, though some were of opinion that such confession was according to Scripture, it was left optional and was not received as the doctrine of the Church. It is true that confession of sin was looked upon as a duty, but it was left to the judgment of each Christian to make the confession alone to his Maker, or to express

¹ Collier, vol. ii., pp. 359, 413.

² Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 409.

it in words to his spiritual adviser. By the decision at this council such option was denied, and thus the influence and power of the priesthood was immensely increased.¹

The former acts concerning the celibacy of the clergy were confirmed at this council. Innocent also passed a decree that the secular powers were to be compelled to drive heresy from their dominions, and that all persons filling temporal or spiritual jurisdiction should be obliged to swear obedience to this canon.²

The mendicant or begging friars were first established in the beginning of this century, and surpassed all others in the purity of their manners, the extent of their fame, and the number of their privileges. By the tenor of their institutions they were to remain entirely destitute of fixed revenues. The Roman see was fully alive to the injury which the Church suffered by the rise of different sects, brought about by the dissolute habits of the monks and other ecclesiastics. Many of the so-called heretics maintained that poverty was the distinguishing mark of a servant of Christ, and reproached the Church with its opulence, asserting that all the vices and corruptions of the day sprang from that cause. These sects gained much in the estimation of the multitude by their contempt of riches. The appearance of the mendicant friars was therefore hailed with delight at Rome, and pope Innocent III. bestowed upon them distinguishing marks of his protection and favour.

The principal of these orders were the Dominicans, or black friars, and the Franciscans, called also grey friars.

The Dominicans took their name from Dominic Guzman, a Spanish gentleman, born A.D. 1170, who spent many years in preaching against the Albigenses and other enemies of Romish doctrines. He obtained the consent of pope Innocent III. to establish his order, and received from him and his successor Honorius III. much countenance and encouragement. From the year 1217 the increase of the Dominicans was rapid. Their principal business was to extirpate error and heresy; they were at first called preaching friars, because public instruction was one of the ends of their institution. Dominic obliged his brethren to take a vow of absolute poverty, and ordered that no lands or other endowments should be accepted by them. A company of these black friars came to England A.D. 1221, and, having preached before Stephen Langton, archbishop of Canterbury, were permitted to go on to Oxford. Towards the end of the century the lord mayor of London gave them a grant of two whole streets, and the site retains its name of Blackfriars to this day.

The Franciscans owe their origin to Francis, the son of a merchant at Assisi, in Italy, who was born A.D. 1180. When young he had led a dissolute life; but after some severe illnesses he became a changed man, and gave himself up to acts of devotion

¹ Mosheim, vol. ii., pp. 408, 420.

² Foxe, vol. i., p. 287. Collier, vol. ii., p. 444.

which approached insanity. Some time after this he was in a church at Assisi, when he heard what he considered a special call to himself. Some one read the gospel in which are the words, "Provide neither gold nor silver nor brass in your purses," &c., St. Matthew x. 9, 10. This produced a most powerful effect upon his mind. Considering voluntary and perfect poverty as the essence of religion, he enjoined it upon himself and those who followed him. Such was the origin of the celebrated Franciscan order. In the year 1215, Francis and his small company of followers went to Rome and received the sanction of pope Innocent III., which was confirmed by his successor Honorius, 1223. This order was called the minor friars, or minorites, as their founder, in his excessive humility, spoke of them as "less than the least of all men." They went into various parts of Europe, and came to England A.D. 1224, where their first establishment was at Canterbury.

These two great orders restored activity and energy to the Church by the zeal which they employed in discovering and extirpating heretics and confirming the wavering multitude in their obedience to the popes. The pontiffs, sensible of the obligation they owed to these friars raised them to high stations and granted them extraordinary privileges; amongst which were permission to preach to the multitude, to hear confession, and pronounce absolution without any license from or consultation with the bishops, and the distribution of an extensive store of indulgences. The marks of favour and protection thus lavished upon the friars produced bitter dissensions between them and the bishops, but they rose rapidly in public estimation and were regarded with the greatest veneration in all the countries of Europe.

Other mendicant orders arose after the lateran council of 1215; but at a council held by pope Gregory X. at Lyons, A.D. 1272, they were reduced and confined to the two we have named, and to two other societies called the Carmelites, or white friars, and the Augustinians, or Austin friars. The former had been instituted in Palestine during the twelfth century, when Almeric, bishop of Antioch, had assembled a small body of men and commenced a home at Mount Carmel. In 1229 they were obliged to leave their retreat and seek a shelter in Europe. They came to England about 1245, where they gained greater favour than in any other country, settling in London at a place which still goes by the name of Whitefriars. A few words may be added respecting the Austin friars, who were the least considerable in influence and number.

Notwithstanding the existence of the three orders we have described, there were several knots of men who lived as hermits with their own peculiar rule and discipline. Pope Alexander IV., A.D. 1256, collected these strays into a community under a superior, and gave them the title of Augustinian Hermits, called also Austin friars.¹ We find in this and the succeeding centuries that the above

¹ Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 371—376. Also a short sketch in the *Parish Magazine* for 1878, edited by the Rev. J. Erskine Clarke, M.A.

orders of friars were employed, not only in spiritual affairs, but also in temporal and political matters of the greatest consequence, and in many occupations which were inconsistent with and far removed from the monastic character and profession.

Dominic de Guzman is considered by many writers to have been the originator of the tribunal of the Inquisition, or at least to have been a zealous assistant of those papal legates who, at the beginning of this century, were sent by Innocent III. into the southern provinces of France to extirpate heresy. These and others who followed them were as unscrupulous in the severity of the measures they employed, as they were untiring in their efforts to discover those on whom the slightest suspicion of heresy rested; and they were distinguished in common discourse as inquisitors. In the pontificate of Honorius III. in 1229 a council of inquisitors was erected in every city; but finally Gregory IX., A.D. 1233, intrusted the Dominicans with this important commission, and that fearful tribunal known by the name of the Inquisition took its rise from this period.¹ Fire and sword, the rack and the gibbet, have rendered the word odious and repulsive. Spain, which gave birth to the founder of the Dominican order, possesses the unenviable notoriety of having been most zealous in the hateful work of the Inquisition.

¹ Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 427.

CHAPTER XVIII.

CENTURY XIII.

HENRY III., A.D. 1216. POPE INNOCENT IV. STATE OF WALES.

KING JOHN was succeeded by his son Henry III., a boy of nine years of age. The earl of Pembroke governed the country as protector during the first years of his minority, and gave much satisfaction by causing the young king to renew and confirm the Great Charter, though with a few alterations. Its provisions, however, were ill kept. Henry, when he grew to man's estate, proved unfitted for the times in which he lived, his character though gentle and humane being destitute of firmness and activity. He was easily swayed by those about him, and his partiality to foreigners, which no remonstrances could induce him to abandon, gave great offence to the barons, who naturally objected to see favours bestowed on aliens which ought in fairness to have been conferred on the king's own subjects.

About A.D. 1225 the king applied for money to his lords spiritual and temporal assembled at Westminster; upon which the bishops and barons, after consulting together, promised to satisfy his demands, provided he granted them the liberties for which they had petitioned. The king thereupon signed and sealed Magna Charta and the Forest Charter, copies of which were sent into every county. About this time the great councils began to receive the name of parliament.

Stephen Langton, archbishop of Canterbury, died A.D. 1228. It appears that he had remonstrated against the yearly payment of a thousand marks to the pope by the sovereign, and had entered his protest in writing against John's resignation of the crown to the pope. It is to him that we are indebted for the division of our Bible into chapters. He was a true Englishman, and stood up for the liberties of his country.¹

The avarice of the Roman see was much complained of during this reign. The pope was constantly engaged in war with Frederick II., emperor of Germany, to carry on which he required money, and after archbishop Langton's death he demanded from laity as well as clergy the tenth of all their moveables. When the pope's legate read the letter containing this demand to the king, who was surrounded by his lords spiritual and temporal, the laity at once said they would give no tenths; but the clergy fearing excommunication yielded, though not without murmurs. The Irish had to pawn and sell even their church furniture, and sent their contributions with much anger and impatience at the exaction. The tax was levied in a most oppressive manner on the clergy throughout the

¹ Hume, ch. xii. Collier, vol. ii., pp. 462, 467.

kingdom. Matthew Paris, a writer of this age, laments the sad state of affairs: the privileges of the Church lost—the revenues devoted by pious ancestors to the support of religion and the benefit of the poor seized by persons of neither learning nor merit—church preferment, instead of being held by native subjects who reflected credit upon their country by their virtues, being now in the hands of rapacious people, creatures of the court of Rome—and England formerly so illustrious in learning and piety become a prey to unprincipled foreigners. This grievance had become very great, and the barons finding that they were deprived of their right of presentation to benefices, which were filled with foreigners, sent a spirited letter to the pope stating that as a storm had fallen on them, and their liberties were ready to sink, they thought it reasonable to awaken his holiness who was sleeping in St. Peter's vessel; and since his position gave him authority to do justice, they desired he would show them that good quality, and let them remain in possession of their privileges. They stated that, ever since the first planting of Christianity in England, their ancestors had exercised the privilege, upon the vacancy of any living in their patronage, to present a priest to the bishop, who, provided there was no canonical objection against him, was to give him institution; that this privilege had been frequently invaded and foreigners put in by the pope's agents. They desired that the matter might be ratified and the grievance redressed. The pope returned a very smooth answer, and said it was not his intention to interfere with their rights of patronage.¹ The popes at this time were endeavouring to get the whole patronage of the Church into their own hands. Their recommendations to the bishops of persons to fill benefices as they became vacant were called 'mandates;' and it was difficult for the bishops to refuse compliance. Sometimes the popes gave away next presentations to livings before they became vacant by what were called 'letters of provision.' Italians were thus introduced into English benefices, but great disgust and anger were excited by these papal usurpations.

Application for money was again made by the papal see about 1240. A fifth of the revenues of ecclesiastics was demanded. To this the bishops and clergy objected, saying that when they gave their last tenth to the pope it was upon condition that the burden should not be repeated; that it was likewise an attempt upon the liberties of the Church, since those who refused were to be compelled to obedience by ecclesiastical censure; that the Church of Rome possessed its own revenues, the management of which belonged to the pope; while other churches held the same right in their estates and were not bound to pay any tax or arbitrary acknowledgment to the papal see; and they added amongst other remarks that the pope was not the landlord of all their livings. They said also that the revenues of the Church were intended for the maintenance of the clergy, the relief of the poor, and the

¹ Collier, vol. ii., pp. 484, 488.

repair of the consecrated buildings, and ought not to be applied to other uses unless by consent of the universal Church; and that as the contribution was demanded on account of the pope's war with the emperor of Germany, who was an ally of the king of England, they ought not to assist in this contest without the king's leave.

The pope's legate and his assistants being unable to oppose these arguments, used their influence with the king, and succeeded in bringing him round to the point they wished. Pope Gregory, in order to induce the Roman people to supply him with funds for this war, agreed that three hundred of their sons should have benefices in England; and he sent orders to the archbishop of Canterbury and other prelates that no vacant preferment should be filled up until these Romans were provided for. By these and such like methods, says Foxe, "no small rivers of English money went flowing to the pope's sea."¹

The money that went out of England yearly to the pope amounted to sixty thousand marks, a vast sum in those days; and it cannot be a matter of surprise that the nobles resisted this extortion, and, being assembled together at Dunstable, they sent to the pope's agent to desire him to leave the kingdom, or he would lose his life. When pope Innocent IV. held a council at Lyons, A.D. 1245, the barons and people sent him an address with a list of grievances, amongst which were the often-repeated complaints of Italians and other foreigners being placed in their churches, of their leaving their flocks uncared for, and taking out of England more than the king himself received; concluding with the assurance that they could not patiently suffer such oppression and such intolerable grievances, neither by God's grace would they suffer them.² On finding this application disregarded, Bigod earl of Norfolk, with the rest of his countrymen, who had been sent by king Henry to the council, retired and swore that they would never so truckle to Roman avarice as to be brought under tribute, neither would they suffer the revenues of their Church to be seized and carried off by foreigners. The tribute which they so much resented was that which king John had agreed to pay. They said that the nation was dissatisfied with his submission, which was extorted from him when he was in distress; that Stephen Langton, the archbishop of Canterbury, had entered a protest against it in the name of the whole nation; and that, as their ancestors would not have submitted, neither would they submit to such a mark of slavery. Pope Innocent, being indignant that the English should dispute this annual payment, proposed that the king of France should invade England and thus avenge the quarrel; but that prince declined, saying he was at peace with the English, and that an invasion would cause the loss of a great deal of Christian blood.³

¹ Foxe, vol. i., pp. 321, 324. Collier, vol. ii., p. 491.

² Foxe, vol. i., p. 327.

³ Collier, vol. ii., pp. 506, 511.

At this council the haughty pontiff, like another Hildebrand, deposed the emperor of Germany, absolved his subjects from their allegiance, and excommunicated all who should assist him. The emperor wrote to the king of England that the pope had no authority for these actions; that he was resolved to maintain his position and would endeavour to bring the haughtiest of the clergy to more modesty and justice; that he hoped the king and all other princes in Christendom would join him in this, as the sentence was a dangerous invasion of the rights of princes.¹

It has been mentioned that the eastern and western, called the Greek and Latin churches, had a serious controversy in the eighth century respecting image-worship. The differences between them had never been healed, though many attempts were made on the part of the popes to bring the eastern Christians within their jurisdiction. A controversy was also carried on respecting the procession of the Holy Ghost, and concerning the word *filioque* in the Nicene Creed,² or the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son. This became a cause of violent dispute, and all the efforts made during this century proved ineffectual to bring it to a conclusion. The patriarchs of Constantinople, who were the heads of the eastern Church, did not acknowledge the supremacy of the popes of Rome; but the latter constantly endeavoured to bring them under their sway, the unhappy state of the eastern empire being favourable to these ambitious views, as the friendship of Rome was useful to the Greeks in their struggle with the Saracens; but a reunion of the churches continued as remote as ever.³

The Dominican and Franciscan friars, though only recently established in England, advanced greatly in power and opulence, and in public estimation. Their monasteries were handsome, and but little of their original poverty was to be seen. The privilege of hearing confessions granted to these friars by popes Gregory IX. and Innocent IV. was contrary to the canons of the fourth lateran council which decreed that none should make use of a confessor without leave of the parish priest.⁴ When men of fortune lay on their death-beds, they were frequently visited by these friars, who would urge them to make confession and to execute wills in favour of their societies. In short they obtained such general reputation that few people thought they could be saved unless they had a Dominican or Franciscan for their spiritual director. They gained possession of important posts at court, negotiated marriages for princes and great men, and were very devoted to the interests of the pope. They encroached much upon the bishops and parochial clergy by demanding the liberty of preaching in parish churches or wherever they thought fit. They charged the parochial and monastic priests with ignorance; and from thus extolling them-

¹ Collier, vol. ii., pp. 506, 511.

² Collier, vol. iii., p. 371. ³ Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 418.

⁴ Collier, vol. ii., p. 512.

selves and decrying others, they induced many to desert their parish priests and confess to them. Thus the character of the secular or parochial clergy was lowered and the discipline of the Church broken, while at the same time a greater disorder in manners arose. There was more shame and restraint experienced in confessing to the resident rector than to the friars, who were continually travelling about and making no stay when they came; hence there was little mortification in acknowledging misdeeds to those whom they might not see again.¹ It must be said that the corrupt living of monks and clergy, the abuse of patronage by the greater monasteries, and the unpopularity of the persons sent over by the popes to fill the parishes, were amongst the causes that contributed to the ascendancy obtained by the friars, whose vows of poverty gave them also an appearance of superior sanctity.

During the year 1246, the lords spiritual and temporal met in London, when the encroachments of the court of Rome were brought before them by the king. It was stated that the pope, not content with the Peter-pence, made heavy impositions on the country; that the right of patronage was interfered with by papal provisions or grants of benefices; that by this means Italians succeeded each other in church preferments, and misapplied the revenues; that these foreigners neither relieved the poor nor maintained hospitality, and failed in almost every branch of their duty; and, it was added, that the pope had lately sent briefs to several English prelates, commanding them to find gentlemen to serve on horseback in the pope's troops, which military service was due to none but the king and the great lords of the kingdom. These with other grievances were sent by a solemn embassy and laid before pope Innocent IV. The remonstrance forwarded by the barons and commons expressed their displeasure in plain terms, and stated that they should have to take the matter into their own hands, as they could not suffer the Church and kingdom to be thus harassed. The pope still pursued his purpose of collecting revenue under pain of excommunication, and as the king wrote to desire it should not be paid, the English prelates and abbots were placed in a difficult position. Had they felt assured of the king's firmness, they would probably have obeyed him, but knowing his indecision they hesitated. The pope returned a haughty answer to the remonstrance, saying, "The king is at liberty to take his own measures, and I shall take mine." Henry and his nobles, much incensed, caused a proclamation to be made that not a penny should be contributed to the pope, who immediately wrote a threatening letter to the English prelates, directing them to collect the money and pay it to his nuncio. At this moment, when there was a fair opportunity of breaking the papal yoke, the king's courage failed him, and with that weakness for which his character was noted he meanly complied. Thus the noble attempt of the bishops

¹ Collier, vol. ii., pp. 501, 511.

and barons miscarried, and the Church and state remained a prey to Roman avarice.¹

It will be remembered that those who founded churches became the patrons, the presentation to the benefice being under certain conditions in their hands; but it appears from a letter which the English addressed to pope Alexander IV., A.D. 1259, that in several instances this patronage had been given up to the monasteries in full confidence that the monks would carry out the duty which accompanied that privilege by presenting to the bishops persons well qualified for the office. In this confidence the barons said they had been disappointed partly by the avarice of the monasteries, which by procuring appropriations of the proceeds of the livings from the papal see neglected the authority of their diocesans and took the profits to their own use. The pope replied to this by saying that he had granted appropriations of the livings to the monks in the hope of advancing religion, and that it was done to augment the small endowments of some monasteries and to enable them to assist the poor. He promised at last to let the English bishops make some reform in the matter.²

During this period of disorder and oppression we turn with satisfaction to the works of some good men, amongst whom is Robert Grostête, bishop of Lincoln. He was born about 1175, and educated at Oxford, where learning was zealously cultivated, and afterwards followed up his studies at the university of Paris, becoming a proficient in Greek, Hebrew, and French. Knowledge and learning made great progress during the thirteenth century, and Grostête availed himself of every advantage. He made especial efforts to reform the monks and strongly resisted the arbitrary proceedings of pope Innocent IV. When first consecrated to the bishopric in 1235, he greatly favoured the mendicant friars, but his eyes were at length opened to their slavish devotion to the Romish see; and when in 1247 two of them demanded six thousand marks from his diocese, he answered, "Friars, with all reverence to his holiness be it spoken, the demand is as dishonourable as it is impracticable." The bishop when going round his diocese often preached to the people, and required the neighbouring clergy to attend, exhorting them to labour in ministering to their flock.

The Italian intruders, who neither understood the language of the people nor cared to instruct them, were objects of his detestation. He often threw aside the pope's bulls which directed him to present these foreigners, saying he should be the friend of Satan if he committed to them the care of souls. When the pope desired that a nephew of his might be made one of the canons of Lincoln cathedral, Grostête resolutely refused, and wrote to the pope saying it was contrary to the doctrine of Christ to rob men's souls of the benefit of the pastoral office by bestowing it on those who could not speak the language of the people, and that it was quite consistent

¹ Collier, vol. ii., p. 513.

² Collier, vol. ii., p. 560.

with his duty to withstand these enormities. Innocent exclaimed when he received this epistle, "Who is this old dotard who dares to judge my actions? By St. Peter and St. Paul, were I not restrained by my generosity, I would make an example of him to all mankind." One of the cardinals advised the pope not to proceed against the bishop, as what he said was true, and that he was a holy man, and no prelate in Christendom was thought to excel him, nor was it possible to cast any stigma on him, and he added that it was evident a revolt from the Church of Rome would one day take place in Christendom. Innocent paid no heed to this advice, but passed a sentence of excommunication against Grostête. It was however neglected, and this good man continued in quiet possession of his bishopric. He together with others during this century vainly strove in many instances to reform the morals, the wasteful expenditure, and bad habits of the members of religious houses of both sexes.¹ In some cases the monks took the entire profits of the livings, of which they had obtained the patronage, for their own use or left very little for the priest who did the duties of the parish. This was an abuse which the bishop earnestly endeavoured to correct.² Grostête, in a conversation with his chaplain on his death-bed, remarked, "Christ came into the world to save souls; ought he not to be called antichrist who takes pains to ruin souls? Many popes have afflicted the Church, but Innocent IV. has enslaved it more than any." His breath and voice failed, while lamenting the scandalous proceedings that were allowed. He was eloquent and well versed in the Scriptures; his death took place A.D. 1253, and when the pope heard of it he rejoiced that his greatest enemy was removed.³

Sewal, archbishop of York, was another noted and excellent prelate, who was also educated at Oxford. He was exemplary in conduct and possessed of much courage and uprightness of character, but these qualities involved him in quarrels with the Roman see, which caused him much trouble. Being too conscientious to submit to its demands, he withstood the intrusion of unworthy pastors by the popes, and wrote a sharp letter on the subject to pope Alexander IV., who succeeded Innocent IV., telling him that when our Saviour commissioned St. Peter to feed his sheep, he did not give him authority to flay or eat them. Pope Alexander was so much displeased with Sewal that he not only tried to lessen his authority and credit, but sought to injure him in many ways, and at last excommunicated him, which sentence however appears now to have lost its power. Sewal was greatly beloved and honoured by his countrymen. On his death-bed he complained of the pope's injustice, and made his appeal to heaven.⁴

We must now retrace our steps to give some account of affairs in Wales. That country had continued in a very unsettled state;

¹ Milner, p. 571—575. *The English Reformation*, by Rev. F. C. Massingberd, p. 80.

² Collier, vol. ii., p. 527. ³ Milner, p. 576—579.

⁴ Collier, vol. ii., p. 547.

the native princes and chiefs were disunited, and the Norman barons very tyrannical. Llewelyn ab Iorwerth, prince of North Wales, had married a daughter of king John, and joined the English barons when they rose in arms against him. In the year 1218, Llewelyn, who had gained possession of nearly all Wales, did homage to king Henry III. at Gloucester, and promised to restore the castles of Carmarthen and Cardigan with other lands and fortresses which had been taken from the barons in South Wales. This promise, however, he did not fulfil, and soon afterwards laid waste the lands of the earl of Pembroke, who, returning from Ireland to avenge the injury, forced Llewelyn to retire into North Wales. It would be too tedious to relate the continued warfare carried on between Llewelyn ab Iorwerth and the Norman barons. The former sometimes gained an advantage, which was presently checked by the appearance of king Henry with his troops. The strife was carried on with great barbarity; the churches suffered, and the whole country appears to have been in a miserably unsettled state. In 1233, Llewelyn again did homage at Shrewsbury, but soon after joined the English barons headed by Pembroke the earl mareschal, whom Henry's conduct had driven to revolt. The king's frequent violation of the charter and indifference to his promises had aroused this spirit of discontent, and Llewelyn in spite of his acts of homage, and his connection by marriage, appears to have lost no opportunity of attacking the king of England. As the Welsh prince advanced in years, he became desirous of peace. He was very anxious that his favourite son David should succeed him, and wishing to procure the protection of king Henry, offered to hold his dominions in future as a fief of the English crown. Many of the Welsh chieftains approved of this; others rejected the idea with disdain. At Strata Florida, in Cardiganshire, anciently called Stratflure, an abbey was founded by Rhys ab Gruffydd in 1164. This and Conway had charge of the records of the principality, and it was a place of interment for many of the Welsh princes.¹ Here in 1237 Llewelyn invited the chieftains to meet him; he wished them to take the oaths of fidelity to David, who was his son by the daughter of king John, in preference to Gruffydd his son by a former marriage. David afterwards seized part of Gruffydd's lands, and the disputes between the brothers caused much bloodshed in North Wales. At this time, A.D. 1240, Llewelyn ab Iorwerth died and was succeeded by David. A recent Welsh writer observes that the character of Llewelyn was distinguished for enterprise and patriotism. He founded the abbey of Aberconwy 1185, and endowed it with lands in Carnarvonshire and Anglesey, and in 1237 he founded the friary of Llanfaes in Anglesey over the grave of his wife Joan.²

¹ Meyrick's *History of Cardiganshire*, p. 256. The same writer adds that the present structure of which there are still some remains, was built A.D. 1294, but since the dissolution of the abbey the edifice has been rapidly decaying. Painted glass has been found and ornamented freestone dug up, and it was evidently in former times a magnificent building.

² Williams's *Eminent Welshmen*, p. 301.

This prince had imprisoned his brother Gruffydd, and after swearing fealty to his relative the king of England, endeavoured to shake off his dependence. For this he was excommunicated by the bishop of Bangor. The sanctity of an oath was little regarded in those days, for we find David again doing homage and again breaking faith. He gave up Gruffydd to Henry III., who confined him in the tower of London, from whence he endeavoured to escape, and in so doing fell from the window and was killed. The Welsh prince afterwards sought the pope's protection against king Henry, offering to hold his dominions under the Roman see, and to pay an annual tribute of five hundred marks. To this proposal the pope agreed, but Henry succeeded in putting a stop to the negociation. David carried on a warfare with the English lords of the marches, and the whole country continued in a deplorable state—the land uncultivated, and the people suffering from famine. Matthew Paris says that the bishop of St. David's was reported to have died of grief, and the bishops of Bangor and St. Asaph were reduced to the necessity of asking alms as a means of subsistence, their bishoprics being entirely ruined. David died 1246, and the Welsh chieftains chose Llewelyn and David, the two sons of his half brother Gruffydd, to succeed him. These two princes concluded a peace with the English king, one condition of which was that if they did not adhere to it, the entire forfeiture of their territories would be the consequence.¹

In the year 1253, Henry found some difficulty in obtaining supplies of money, in consequence of his promises to his subjects being unfulfilled and their grievances unredressed. And before parliament granted any supplies, they required that he should ratify the Great Charter in a more solemn manner than he had hitherto done. Accordingly the bishops and abbots were assembled; they held burning tapers in their hands; the Great Charter was read; and sentence of excommunication was denounced against every one who violated the law. The king took part in the ceremony, and swore thus, "I will keep these articles, so help me God, as I am a man, as I am a Christian, as I am a knight, and as I am a king crowned and anointed."² The weakness of this prince's character subjected him to the constant influence of favourites who used their power against the true interests of himself and his people, so that the reasonable wishes and demands of the latter were constantly evaded and disappointed. The barons now adopted more peremptory measures. The earl of Leicester, who was the king's brother-in-law, headed these discontented nobles, and Henry was obliged to submit to their requirements. A council of twenty-four was appointed, of which Leicester was the head. The council directed that four knights should be chosen by each county, to attend the ensuing parliament in order to give an account of the grievances and state of their respective localities. Here we see a

¹ Warrington's *History of Wales*, books vii. and viii.

² Hume, ch. xii.

reproduction of the old witenagemot of the Anglo-Saxon times, and the commencement of our present system of parliamentary representatives. Henry became in reality a prisoner in the hands of the powerful barons; but they soon lost their popularity in the country in consequence of their arbitrary mode of proceeding. After some years of commotion and civil war, Leicester and his forces were defeated by prince Edward, the king's eldest son, who obtained a great victory over them; the earl of Leicester was slain, and the king was again free. From this time he seems to have been more discreet, and to have abstained from those acts of arbitrary power which had afforded a pretext for this formidable rebellion. Prince Edward, having subdued the barons, and finding the kingdom in a composed state, was induced, by his love of glory and the persuasion of Louis IX., king of France, to undertake a crusade against the Saracens in the Holy Land, A.D. 1270. Here he performed acts of great valour and struck such terror into the enemy that they employed an assassin to murder him, who perished in the attempt after wounding the prince in the arm.¹

A national synod was held in London, A.D. 1268, which was attended not only by the English bishops, but by those of Scotland, Ireland, and Wales. Clement IV. was pope at this time and his legate was present. The canons of this council were of great authority and were regarded as a rule of discipline in the English Church. The ninth canon provided against non-residence of clergy; the twentieth, which was evidently directed against indulgences, and in favour of the old discipline of penance, said that "God Almighty, notwithstanding his attribute of mercy, will by no means be bribed for his pardon" "however some persons of dignity in the Church do not seem to consider the justice of the divine proceedings, otherwise they would not go such a length in their commutations, and receive money instead of exerting discipline;" that a man of loose habits will think little of giving way to sin as long as his money can make him innocent, and that such a way is "in effect a license to commit sin." The archdeacons were therefore desired to make use of the discipline of the Church and never to receive any money upon such "scandalous considerations;" and the bishops were enjoined to take care that the archdeacons did their duty in such cases.

The twenty-third canon provided against alienating any part of the tithes from the parochial clergy, as it observed that "these appropriations gave occasion to great abuse and misapplication of the Church revenues;" that sometimes all the profits were taken away and no vicar provided to take care of the parish; and where a vicar was provided, his maintenance was too slender. And the canon further enacted that all the religious houses, which were possessed of appropriate livings, were required to present vicars to such churches and to allow them a sufficient proportion for their maintenance. The thirtieth canon spoke strongly against pluralities

¹ Hume, ch. xii.

and complained that people of interest disobeyed the canons and possessed themselves of several livings; that in consequence of this the Church suffered in credit and authority; and that the power of religion was weakened and poor scholars discouraged. The thirty-fourth canon complained of the abuse of the trust of patronage, and that patrons presented to benefices upon the persons placed in charge promising to pay the patron a certain annual sum out of the living. To prevent such practices so contrary to the interest of religion this canon declared all such promises and contracts void.¹

The old abbey church at Westminster, which had been built by Edward the Confessor, was taken down by Henry III., and rebuilt with much magnificence. Henry died 1272, having reigned fifty-six years, and was succeeded by his son Edward I.

This century is remarkable for the general improvement in learning. Every branch of knowledge was cultivated with zeal. Frederick II., emperor of Germany, and Alphonso of Spain, were specially distinguished for the encouragement they gave to men of genius. The protection thus afforded caused academies to be founded in all the principal cities of Europe,² and no universities were more noted than those of Paris and Oxford. Louis IX., king of France, was a remarkable character: his religious fervour was largely mixed with superstition, but he had the courage of a hero and a strict sense of justice and integrity. His piety and his zeal for the crusades gained him the title of St. Louis. His conduct with regard to the affairs of England was most disinterested; he declined to make war with her at the pope's bidding, and when referred to in the disputes between Henry III. and his barons he interposed only as a peacemaker.³

The Dominican and Franciscan friars were regarded as the most eminent men of learning. Roger Bacon, a Franciscan, who was one of the greatest scholars in this century, was a man of whom Englishmen are justly proud. He was educated at Oxford, and, like his friend Grostête, bishop of Lincoln, proceeded to Paris for the benefit of further study. Surnamed the 'admirable doctor,' he was renowned for his attainments in natural philosophy, mathematics, chemistry, mechanics, and languages. He made many important discoveries, and was far in advance of the age in which he lived.⁴

¹ Collier, vol. ii., p. 562—569.

² Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 341.

³ Hume, ch. xii.

⁴ Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 349.

CHAPTER XIX.

CENTURIES XIII. AND XIV.

EDWARD I. LLEWELYN THE LAST PRINCE IN WALES DIES A.D. 1281.
WYCLIFFE.

EDWARD I., on hearing of his father's death, speedily returned from the Holy land, and was crowned at Westminster Abbey by the archbishop of Canterbury. He made it a rule to observe, except upon extraordinary occasions, all the privileges of the barons which were granted in Magna Charta, and insisted on their observing the privileges of their vassals. By these proceedings the state of the country was soon improved and order restored. Edward's wise laws effectually checked the papal power in England. The king, however, was content to secure the dignity of the crown without regard to matters of doctrine, of which he had little knowledge; but the Church continued from this time free from those invasions of its property, which had been so constant during the reigns of the Norman kings, and had continued during that of Henry III.¹

Edward had been often engaged in war with the Welsh during the lifetime of his father. It will be remembered that Llewelyn, son of that Gruffydd who had been killed when trying to escape from the Tower of London, had along with his brother been chosen to succeed their uncle David. Llewelyn joined in the rebellion which was headed by the earl of Leicester in the reign of Henry III., though he and his brother had concluded a peace with that king; and after the defeat and death of Leicester he found it necessary to appease the anger of Henry by an early submission. He entered into a treaty by which he and his heirs were granted the principality of Wales on condition that they did homage to the English king and performed the usual services due to him and his heirs. He was accordingly summoned by Edward I., on his accession to the English throne, to take the oaths of allegiance, which summons he disobeyed, but Edward was not at that time prepared to punish him for his behaviour.

Llewelyn had contracted an engagement of marriage with Eleanor de Montfort, daughter of the late earl of Leicester, who, with her widowed mother, was then residing in France. In the spring of 1276 the lady, when on her voyage to Wales, was captured by some English ships and conveyed to London, where she was detained. Llewelyn was now in arms and ravaging the English borders. He offered a sum of money as a ransom for Eleanor, which Edward refused to accept unless Llewelyn restored to their owners the land which he had lately taken, and repaired the castles which he

¹ *The Early English Church*, by Rev. Ed. Churton, M.A., p. 384.

had demolished. The following year Edward entered Wales with an army, resolved not to return until he had subdued the Welsh nation. Llewelyn trusted to the natural situation of the country, which had so often baffled the English troops, but when reduced to extremity, he solicited peace. The king returned victorious to London, and was accompanied by Llewelyn, who did homage, and several of the Welsh chieftains accompanied him on the occasion. Edward and his queen visited Glastonbury the following year, where they discovered the remains of king Arthur, as we have related at an earlier part of this history. Llewelyn was summoned to attend the king at Glastonbury, but did not do so. He, however, attended a second summons at Worcester, where Eleanor de Montfort was united to him in marriage, but she died not long afterwards. Dissensions then again broke out, and Llewelyn was joined by his brother David, who had long been a resident at the English court. The Welsh were now in a state of active revolt, and king Edward took the field, being joined on his march to Chester by the border inhabitants. Llewelyn and David retreated towards Snowdon, and a few months passed without any decisive result.

The archbishop of Canterbury then came into Wales and endeavoured to mediate between the Welsh prince and the king, but without success. Edward took possession of the island of Anglesey; and Llewelyn, leaving his brother David in the neighbourhood of Snowdon, went to South Wales, where he was taken by surprise in an expedition which he made, and killed in a skirmish near Builth in December, 1281, after a reign of 36 years. His brother David held out for a time, but was at last compelled to hide himself in woods and morasses, and was eventually betrayed by some of his retainers and given up to Edward. As David had been made a baron of the realm, he was an English subject, and the king proceeded against him as such. He was therefore tried at Shrewsbury by some barons of England, the king himself presiding, and condemned to die as a traitor. He was executed A.D. 1283, and his head was sent to the Tower of London, where it was placed opposite that of his brother Llewelyn.

Edward had now finally subdued Wales, and the government was fixed on the basis of equal laws and common rights. The system of English law was introduced. North Wales was divided into counties; sheriffs were appointed, also courts for administering justice, and it was provided that no Welshman should be sued for debts or trespasses in any town of England. Edward issued a proclamation to the inhabitants, promising them the enjoyment of their lands and liberties, and reserving only to himself the rents and service which had been due to their native princes; he caused strict inquiry to be made respecting these, and their nature was ascertained and determined by juries of Welshmen.¹

¹ Warrington's *History of Wales*, ch. viii. and ix.

The order of bards was common to the Celtic nations, and though Julius Cæsar does not mention them, they are named by ancient travellers in Gaul before the Christian era. They exercised much influence over the minds of the people, and animated the courage of the warriors by their martial strains. "The bards," says an ancient writer, "sang the deeds of illustrious men, described in heroic verses, to the sweet measures of the lyre." They were held in great respect, and a heavy fine was imposed by the laws of Howel Dda on any person who should strike one of the order. An election of bards was made yearly by princes and chieftains. The first class were required to have a genius for poetry and to compose odes in praise of their heroes. They were also keepers of the genealogies of families. The second class were minstrels who played upon instruments, chiefly the harp. The third class were singers. During the first half of the twelfth century laws were passed to restrain their licentious manners, and it is evident this privileged order required such restraint. Amongst the officers of the court of the Welsh princes was the bard of the household. On his appointment he received a harp and a ring, with which gifts he was never to part. There was also a chief musician, who was placed at the upper end of the hall, and if the prince desired music, he was to sing first in praise of God and then in praise of kings. Giraldus Cambrensis says (¹) the love of music amongst the Welsh was remarkable; in playing they charmed the ear with their sweetness and the quickness and delicacy of their modulation. They sang in parts, but united the voices at times with great melody, and minstrelsy was so highly esteemed that if any serf succeeded in acquiring it so as to receive a testimonial of skill, he could not be treated as a bondman again. It will be easily understood that the bards had much power for good or evil, but they were too frequently the abettors of war, and instead of healing dissensions, widened the breaches already made.

Edward I. was well aware that the bards had been especially active in urging the Welsh to maintain their independence; and as the Normans had endeavoured to destroy all traces of Anglo-Saxon saints and heroes because they assisted to keep up old memories, so did a similar motive govern Edward's conduct towards the bards. And his cruel order for their destruction, which edict continued in force until the end of the reign of Henry IV., a century later, was ill calculated to soothe the Welsh or gain their affections.

The introduction of English laws, though carried out in a liberal spirit, was very distasteful to the natives of Cambria; nor can we be surprised that such should have been the case.² It is not to be supposed that a gallant people smarting under defeat should appreciate the advantages that would follow their union with the more civilized, rich, and powerful kingdom. However much we sympathize with this portion of our fellow-countrymen in the loss

¹ *Description of Wales*, ch. xii. and xiii.

² Warrington, ch. ix. Woodward's *History of Wales*, ch. xxxi.

of their independence, it must be owned that under the sway of their native princes they had not made the same progress in learning and civilization as the Anglo-Saxons had under their rulers, so that the subjection of Wales had become as necessary for the improvement of the Welsh people as for the common good of England. It would have been an infinite gain to the Cymry if they had been entirely subjugated some time before, and had shared in the more advanced civilization of the Normans, instead of being so long shut out from the benefits which had followed the conquest of England by the latter.

In reading the history of the country collected from the materials left to historians, we are impressed with the internal discord which prevailed. Sometimes we find them united under one prince, and ere long we again find them under the rule of contending chieftains; we find brother fighting against brother, or if at peace amongst themselves, their arms were turned against their Anglo-Saxon neighbours; their minds being more occupied with the hope of regaining the land they had lost than with the improvement of that which they possessed. Thus they fell backwards instead of advancing, whilst the "savage Saxons," as their bards indignantly termed the victors, were gradually gaining in knowledge and civilization. Giraldus, who wrote in the twelfth century, describes the habits and manners of the people. They were all trained to war, and esteemed it a disgrace to die in bed, but an honour to fall in battle. They lived on the produce of their flocks and herds, paid no attention to commerce, and very little to the cultivation of the land. They were usually frugal and temperate in their habits, both in food and dress, yet when surrounded by plenty, were extravagant. None were known to beg, for the houses of all were open, as hospitality and liberality were considered the first virtues. Shelter and food were neither offered nor asked, for travellers entered the dwellings naturally, and only delivered up their arms. Their houses were not furnished with tables, they placed their dishes before them on rushes or fresh grass. Their beds were also of rushes, covered with a coarse kind of cloth. Their mode of living bespoke the disturbed state of the country, which left men neither leisure nor inclination to settle, as they knew not who might be the master of their house on the morrow; and this state of things accounts for their having retrograded in civilization.

The same writer speaks of their quick intellect and ready wit, their boldness and confidence in address and reply, which belonged equally to the highest and lowest classes, even in the presence of their princes and chieftains. They esteemed noble birth above all things, and even the common people referred back their descent to six or seven generations. Easily urged to undertake an action, they wanted perseverance to carry it on. There existed amongst them a great want of respect for truth; they were too apt to swear falsely for the sake of some advantage to be gained. Thus in civil and ecclesiastical causes each party was ready to swear what was

expedient for its purpose.¹ After the lapse of centuries, how many of these gifts and failings still cling to the Cymry!

Edward made some stay in Wales. He erected the castle of Carnarvon, and, with the view of curbing the Welsh and rewarding the nobility who had served him in the war, he gave lands and lordships to his English barons. He also formed Carnarvon, Aberystwith, and other towns into corporations, granting them privileges in order to encourage trade and attract the Welsh from their mountain retreats to a more sociable manner of life. The people received all his advances with reluctance; they were unwilling to yield obedience to any but a prince of their own country, or to one who was born in Wales. Edward requested his queen to join him at Carnarvon, at which place she gave birth to a son, whom the politic monarch presented to the Welsh chieftains as their native prince. He received the title of Prince of Wales, and, his elder brother dying soon afterwards, he became the heir of the English crown, and this title has ever since been borne by the eldest son of the English sovereigns.

The archbishop of Canterbury also visited Wales with the view of soothing the minds of the clergy by redressing their grievances, and by repairing the churches which had been much damaged during the disorders of the times.²

Edward's attention was now drawn to Scotland. He had hoped to unite his youthful son to the heiress of that kingdom, but her death put a stop to the project, and was the cause of a disputed succession to the Scottish crown. The parliament of that kingdom, thus threatened with a civil war, appealed to Edward I., who decided in favour of John Baliol, at the same time asserting that he made his decision in right of being liege lord and superior of that country. The king's claim being resented by the Scotch, led to a war between the two kingdoms; Edward, who wished to annex the whole of Scotland, marched an army thither, and, subduing the southern part, brought Baliol a prisoner to London and lodged him in the tower. We have frequently spoken of the homage done by the Scottish kings. It arose from the fact that the country north of the Tweed and south of the Forth and Clyde had formerly belonged to the Northumbrian kingdom, and a portion of it to the Strathclyde Britons. The several grants of these lands to the kings of Scotland were accompanied by a claim to homage. The homage of the Welsh princes was constantly exacted from the days of Egbert onwards. From Scotland it was also demanded, but the final result was different. Wales became incorporated with the English kingdom in this reign; but Scotland became independent in the reign of Edward's successor. Edward had lived to secure his Welsh conquest; but he died before he secured that of Scotland, and his son was too weak to attempt it. The claim to homage by the English kings had caused numerous disputes, one country

¹ Giraldus Cambrensis, *Description of Wales*.

² Warrington, *Wales*, ch. ix.

asserting and the other denying the right. Baliol died quietly in France; Sir William Wallace maintained for many years the cause of Scottish freedom, but being betrayed into the hands of the English, was conveyed to London where he was executed. Robert Bruce pursued his claim to the throne of Scotland, and war with England was resumed.¹

We must now return to ecclesiastical affairs. Since the days of the first Gregory, no pope ever attained the dignity with purer intentions than Celestine V., but he had not Gregory's talents for business and government. He attempted to reform abuses and check the luxury of ecclesiastics, but the Roman Church of his day was very different in morals, discipline, and belief to that which it had been at the end of the sixth century; and had Celestine possessed Gregory's genius, its corruptions would still have baffled his efforts. He found reform impossible, and resigned his office partly by his own wish and partly by the advice of him who succeeded to the popedom, Boniface VIII. The rites and ceremonies, which were added to divine service in this century in order to make the externals of devotion more striking, were very numerous; they were directed by the popes, the clergy, and monastic orders.²

Boniface became pope A.D. 1294, and was a plague to both Church and state, and a disturber of the peace of nations. His attempts to increase the power of the Roman see were carried to the greatest lengths; but seeing that former popes had lost influence over the clergy by demanding large sums of money, he thought it prudent to adopt different measures. In order to regain power he eased the clergy from papal exactions, and forbade them, under pain of excommunication, to pay any taxes to the public authorities without his consent, adding the same penalty for all princes or ministers who endeavoured to collect them. It is said that this bull was procured by the archbishop of Canterbury to protect ecclesiastics from the calls Edward made on them for money, and when the king demanded a fifth of their moveables, they excused themselves on this plea. Edward did not immediately come to extremities; but after he had caused all their barns and granaries to be locked up, and prohibited all rents to be paid to the clergy, he conferred with them on the subject. The archbishop, undismayed by the king's resolute proceedings, told him they owed obedience to two sovereigns—their spiritual and their temporal lords; but they were bound in a stricter sense to the former, and, therefore, could not comply with demands which were made in contradiction to his decree.³

It must be allowed that Edward I. had seized upon Church property in a very arbitrary manner, by taking the money and plate which belonged to churches and monasteries to which he had no

¹ See Freeman, vol. i., p. 122—130. Hume, ch. xiii. Russell, *History of the Church in Scotland*, vol. i., p. 104.

² Milner, p. 569. Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 421.

³ Hume, ch. xiii. Mosheim, p. 367.

right; and when we consider how the clergy had been plundered during the previous reign by agents from Rome, we cannot be surprised that they tried to avoid further demands. The king paid no attention to the pope's bull, but told the clergy, as they refused to support the civil government, they must not expect protection from its laws, neither were they worthy to receive it. He ordered the judges to do every one justice against them, but to do them justice against no man. This placed the ecclesiastics in a miserable position. Even the archbishop of Canterbury was attacked in the highway; for the unprincipled and worthless took advantage of this state of things. Edward at length gained his point in spite of the pope's threats.

Though the king exercised his power in a harsh and arbitrary manner in this case, it is clear that the clergy had no right to refuse support to the civil government, and the pope assumed an unwarrantable authority when he forbade their doing so. The episcopate reaches no further than matters purely spiritual; the clergy are subjects as well as the laity. The state cannot consecrate bishops and priests, neither can it annul their sacred office. The authority which our Saviour gave the Church can have no dependence upon the state because it was not derived from it, and the people are commanded to obey those who have this spiritual authority: Heb. xiii. 17. But our Saviour has given the Church no authority to encroach upon the rights of the state. To interfere with the oaths of allegiance, to dispose of kingdoms, and to set up the subject against the prince—these powers were claimed by the popes of Rome; but they were violent usurpations of civil rights. The apostles and primitive bishops, though they propagated the Christian faith against the prohibitions of heathen states, were always inoffensive to the "powers that be," and gave unto Cæsar that which was his due.¹

The tribute of one thousand yearly marks, to which king John had subjected the kingdom, had been paid pretty regularly; but it was no longer called a tribute, and the king seems always to have given it with great reluctance. Sometimes the arrears were suffered to run on for some years; but as the princes in that age continually required the pope's good offices for some concession or other, the court of Rome always found means to obtain the money. The popes gained a large sum from first fruits and tenths: the former was the compulsory payment by every clergyman who held a benefice or living of the first fruits, or one year's profits of his living, and the latter was the tenth part of the annual profits afterwards. The pope's claim of the tenths was not complied with in this country till the reign of king John, and even then it was only exacted of such clergymen as had received their livings from the popes themselves; but in the fourteenth century Clement V. and John XXII. demanded it of all beneficed clergymen by whomsoever presented.

¹ See Collier, vol. ii., pp. 576, 609.

Edward restrained the usurpations of the papal power, and was the first prince that passed a statute of mortmain. This prevented the clergy from gaining those new acquisitions of lands which they were prohibited, by the ecclesiastical laws, from alienating when acquired. The design of this statute was to check the growth of the abbeys and to prevent the accumulation of wealth by the Church, but it was often evaded.¹

Edward was possessed of great courage and enterprise; he fully annexed to his crown the principality of Wales, and endeavoured to unite the whole island under one head by reducing Scotland. The people derived great advantages during his reign; disorders were checked and trade was encouraged; but though a friend to law and justice, he caused much discontent by his frequent disregard of the great charter, of which both nobles and people were very jealous. In the end the king confirmed these laws, with the addition that no taxes should be imposed without the consent of parliament.

In this reign a further advance towards parliamentary representation took place, as the king issued writs to the sheriffs desiring them to send to parliament, together with two knights from each shire, two deputies from each borough within their county, and these were to be provided with sufficient powers to consent to what the king and his council required; "as it is a most equitable rule," said the king in his preamble to the writs, "that what concerns all should be approved by all." The commons, however, were still much below the rank of legislators, and, after they had given their consent to the taxes required of them, they separated, though the parliament continued to sit and dispatch business. The large estates conferred by William I. on his barons and chieftains did not long remain undivided; various causes contributed to their partition into smaller portions, and thus the number of knights and lesser barons, or what we call the gentry, continually increased, and the house of county representatives was gradually separated from that of the peers and formed a distinct order in the state. The growth of commerce increased the wealth and station of the burgesses; and as they, like the knights of shires, represented particular bodies of men, they were united with the latter in the same house, and thus the third estate, that of the house of commons, gradually reached its present form. The country gentlemen no longer disdained to appear as deputies from the boroughs, the distinction in rank between county and borough members was lost, and the lower house, therefore, acquired a great increase of influence. The commons supported the king against the power of the great lords, who were consequently obliged to treat them with consideration, and the lower house rose by degrees to its present importance. It may, indeed, be said that Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, began the work which Edward I. carried on; and though Simon fell beneath the sword of Edward while in arms against his father, yet the wise policy shown by the victor and the

¹ Collier, vol. ii., p. 577.

parliamentary constitution, which he gave, will ever make the reign of Edward I. a memorable one in the annals of English history. He "knew that the strength of a sovereign lies in the strength of his people." The days of foreign rule had passed away—barons and people were united, the Normans had blended with the English nation, and Edward I. may be considered the first king after the Norman invasion who deserved to be called an Englishman. It is true that some centuries had yet to pass ere the rights of the crown and the rights of the people were fully defined; but our constitution, though slow in growth, has long been the admiration and envy of foreign nations, and one of which Englishmen are justly proud.¹

Edward I. summoned deputies from the inferior clergy to lay before them his necessities and to ask for some supply. They scrupled to meet on the king's writ. He, therefore, issued it to the archbishops, who summoned the clergy, and they, obedient to their spiritual superiors, no longer hesitated to meet in convocation. This was the cause why the ecclesiastics were separated into two houses of convocation under their archbishops of Canterbury and York.² Since the time of Edward I. the nation has been represented by parliament meeting in two houses, the peers and the commons; and the Church has been represented by the two convocations of Canterbury and York, and the clergy assessed themselves for taxes in their convocation as the commons did in their house. This arrangement was changed in the reign of Charles II. by the lord chancellor and the archbishop of Canterbury; the clergy then gave up their privilege of self-taxation, and consented to pay the taxes levied by parliament.

The Jews, who had settled in England during this and the preceding reigns, were treated with much cruelty; they were subjected to great extortion, many were hanged, and an immense number were deprived of their goods and banished the kingdom. An ill-judged zeal for Christianity was one cause of the rigour displayed towards this unhappy people.

We have stated that Robert Bruce laid claim to the Scottish throne. He was crowned by the bishop of St. Andrew's, and the Scotch resolved to shake off the yoke of England. Edward assembled an army and prepared to enter the country, when he became ill and died near Carlisle, having reigned 35 years.

Edward II., often called Edward of Carnarvon, succeeded his father A.D. 1307. This prince was much influenced by favourites, and though of a mild and gentle disposition, was unfitted for his high position. His reign was a very disturbed one, and towards the close of it he retired amongst his Welsh subjects in Glamorganshire for protection from the barons, and was concealed in the abbey of Neath; but he was compelled to leave his retreat, and afterwards deposed, and basely murdered when in confinement in

¹ See Hume, ch. xiii. Freeman, vol. v., p. 728.

² Hume, ch. xiii., p. 310.

Berkeley castle. Both civil and ecclesiastical affairs were unsettled during his reign. The arbitrary power of the preceding kings had pressed heavily on a high-spirited nobility as well as on the clergy and people. On the other hand, the turbulent spirit of the barons must not be forgotten, though we acknowledge with gratitude their successful efforts to obtain the great charter with its inestimable privileges.

Edward III. succeeded his father A.D. 1327. The Scottish king, Robert Bruce, had gained a great victory over the forces of Edward II. at Bannockburn; after the death of Bruce, whose son was a minor, Edward III. renewed the war with Scotland, but could not succeed in conquering that kingdom. He and his son Edward, called the Black Prince from the colour of his armour, were much engaged in war with France; and from this period we may date the great animosity which existed for so many centuries between the two countries. But, as these wars with Scotland and France are not connected with matters belonging to Church history, we will not enter further into the subject.

The circumstances which chiefly call for our attention are the stand made by the king and his parliament against the usurpations of the Church of Rome, and the protests of various members of our Church in regard to false doctrine, and against the vices and influence of the mendicant or begging friars. In fact, there were many holy men and women during the middle ages who led deeply devotional lives, who looked for pardon through the blood of Christ, and who sought sanctification through the Holy Spirit. Errors and superstitions were increasing; but it was not until after Christendom sought to reform itself in the sixteenth century that Rome succeeded at the council of Trent in riveting the chains of false doctrine on those churches of her communion which continued to acknowledge the supremacy of the pope.

The king's chaplain and confessor Bradwardine, who had been educated at Merton College, Oxford, was a scholar and a mathematician, and as remarkable for the uprightness and strictness of his life as for his learning. He attended Edward in his French wars; not sparing him if he thought he had done wrong, but speaking with freedom; at the same time he never forgot the respect due to the king's position, neither was his advice taken amiss by his sovereign. He was twice nominated to the see of Canterbury, and on the second occasion was consecrated, but he did not long survive his promotion. Bradwardine frequently preached before the army persuading them to make good use of their victories, and telling them to attribute their success to the blessing of God. By these means he seems to have restrained the soldiery from those excesses into which they too often fall.¹ Had his life been spared, something might have been done towards a reformation of the English Church, which would probably have been carried on with as much zeal but with more judgment and sounder knowledge than

¹ Collier, vol. iii., p. 109.

was afterwards shown by our first reformer Wycliffe. But the age was so far gone in error that truth could not be restored by gentle means. This good man seems to have been deeply sensible of the sinfulness of the human heart, the need of the Holy Spirit, and the preciousness of Christ's grace. We thus see that God had not forsaken his Church in these islands, having raised up a defender of gospel truth who would have done honour to the brightest time.¹

Fizraf, or Fitzralph (called also Armachanus), was born in Ireland, but educated at Oxford, and is said to have translated the Bible into Irish. He became archbishop of Armagh, and was distinguished for the part he took in opposing the begging friars, who had so encroached on the rights of the parochial clergy. On one occasion he was invited to preach in London, where he delivered several sermons against the practices of the mendicant orders. These sermons were preached in English instead of Latin, and gave great offence. Fitzralph maintained that it was each man's duty to support himself by honest labour; that to subsist by begging should be a matter of necessity and not of choice, and that the Son of God never taught otherwise. The friars, especially the Franciscans and Dominicans, had long since shown a readiness to acquire those riches with which their houses were well endowed. They were, however, highly incensed that the rule of their order should be represented as unscriptural, and the archbishop was cited by them to appear before pope Innocent IV. In 1352 he pleaded before the pope with eloquence and skill, and defended the rights of the parochial clergy against the intrusions of the mendicants; but his "apology against the friars," though giving a true account of the state of the Church at that time, was delivered in vain.² He was persecuted by both civil and ecclesiastical powers, and spent seven or eight years in banishment, where he died A.D. 1360. In a sort of confession or prayer the archbishop described the history of his life and of the manner in which he was led to give up the opinions of different schools of philosophy which were very prevalent during this and the preceding century. The works of the learned heathen philosopher Aristotle were in great repute, and scholars and divines were much given to their study; nor was this all, for his opinions on many subjects became theirs. Great disputes took place between these learned doctors and the Bible divines, as those were called who studied the Scriptures and the ancient fathers of the Church. Fitzralph was led to see his error and to study Holy Scripture. He alluded to this in the following words: "To thee be praise, glory, and thanksgiving, O Jesus, who hast said, 'I am the way, the truth, and the life.' Thou hast shown me the way; thou hast taught me the truth; and thou hast promised me life."³

The Dominican and Franciscan friars now took the lead among

¹ *History of the Reformation*, by the Rev. F. C. Massingberd, p. 116. Milner, p. 584.

² Massingberd, p. 113. Foxe, vol. i., p. 464.

³ Milner, p. 583.

the monastic orders. Their influence had become so extensive at the court of Rome and in the councils of European princes that nearly all matters of importance were carried on under their direction. The universities had always been unfavourable to their pretensions, and their increasing power caused much jealousy, in which the higher as well as the lower ecclesiastics participated; a jealousy which even amounted to hatred, especially amongst the native parochial clergy in this country. There was scarcely a province or university in Europe in which bishops, clergy, and learned men were not warmly engaged in opposing these two orders, who employed all their influence in undermining the ancient discipline of the Church, and took upon themselves a certain superintendence in religious matters. The university of Oxford made a resolute stand against their encroachments.¹ The secular or parochial clergy endeavoured to maintain their ground against these overpowering opponents, and the carvings still to be seen in some of our cathedrals show the sentiments which were felt towards them. Friars are represented as foxes preaching, with the neck of a stolen goose peeping out of the hood behind; as wolves giving absolution with a sheep muffled up in their cloaks; as apes sitting by a sick man's bed with a crucifix in one hand, while the other hand is in the sufferer's pocket.

This year (1366) the parliament met at Westminster. The pope had insisted upon the king doing homage and paying the yearly acknowledgment of one thousand marks, both of which claims owed their origin to king John, and this demand had been accompanied by a threat to cite the king to Rome to answer for his default. Edward asked the advice of his parliament, which unanimously declared that neither John nor any other king could bring his dominions under such subjection without the consent of parliament, which consent had not been obtained, and if the pope attempted to enforce this claim, the king and all his subjects should oppose and resist it. The king was so far provoked by the pope's menace that he stopped the payment of the Peter-pence, but this stoppage was only temporary. The papal interference with the rights of patrons was checked in this reign, and appeals to Rome were forbidden under pain of outlawry.

About 1374, there being great complaints of foreigners holding much of the Church preferment, the king caused inquiry to be made into the subject, but had previously sent an embassy to Rome to desire the pope to leave the election of bishops to the chapters. In another parliament held towards the end of this reign many acts were passed against the usurpation of Rome, which was affirmed in a bill passed A.D. 1376 to be the cause of all the "plagues, murrain, famine, and poverty of the realm;" and it was observed that God had committed his sheep to the pope to be "pastured, and not shorn or shaven."² Parliament complained that

¹ Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 473.

² Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, vol. i., p. 482. Collier, vol. iii., pp. 127, 133.

the pope's impositions and avarice were intolerable; that twenty thousand marks yearly were drawn out of the kingdom for the benefit of cardinals and other foreigners; that the court of Rome had this very year laid hands upon the annates or first fruits of all the benefices in England; and that the pope's agents collected a no less sum for the use of his holiness, and that the mischief must be vigorously opposed, and the king and nobility must remonstrate with the court of Rome on this subject.¹

England had at various periods protested against new and false doctrines introduced into the Church by the Roman see; her complaints were at this time chiefly directed against its avarice and power. Corruptions both in doctrine and practice prevailed to an immense extent, but we shall now find that people's eyes were being opened to these errors.

John Wycliffe, who was born A.D. 1324, and rose into notice towards the end of this reign, was a professor of divinity in the university of Oxford, and a man of great learning. We have mentioned that Fitzralph, archbishop of Armagh, had attacked the mendicant orders with great severity. Wycliffe, about 1360, animated by his example, defended the privileges of his university against all the mendicant orders, and, becoming bolder, attacked the monks and their proceedings, and even the papal power itself, and exposed the superstition of the times and the many absurd notions on religious subjects. He exhorted the laity to study the Scriptures, and translated them into English in order that they might be more universally read.² Wycliffe's sermons and writings soon made a stir in England, and ere long they became known at Rome, when pope Gregory XI. desired the archbishop of Canterbury to summon him to give an account of his doctrine and to keep him in custody till further orders came from Rome. A synod was accordingly held at St. Paul's cathedral, where the archbishop, the bishop of London, and others were present. Wycliffe, who was rector of Lutterworth, in the diocese of Lincoln, answered the summons, and was accompanied by John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, and Lord Percy, who encouraged him to be firm. A vast concourse of people assembled around the cathedral, and the bishop of London was addressed in so insolent a manner by Lancaster and Percy that the court broke up, and little was done, excepting that Wycliffe was ordered to be silent, which order he obeyed for a time. The patronage, bestowed upon him by the duke of Lancaster, originated probably more from political motives than religious convictions; but it was very valuable to the reformer upon this occasion, as Lancaster was a son of the king, and Percy was the lord marshal of England. Their conduct at the synod, however, added no real honour to Wycliffe's cause, and it is only justice to say that the behaviour of the prelates was more becoming to the occasion.³

¹ Collier, vol. iii., p. 135.

² Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 474.

³ Milner, p. 595. Collier, vol. iii., p. 139.

Edward III. died A.D. 1377, shortly after these proceedings took place, and was succeeded by his grandson Richard II., son of Edward the Black Prince, who had died during the previous year. Richard being only twelve years of age at his grandfather's death, his uncle, John of Gaunt, was appointed protector of the kingdom during his minority.

An act of parliament was passed during the reign of Richard II. which curtailed the power of the pope very considerably in this country; it was called the statute of *Præmunire*. An act of a somewhat similar nature had been passed in the reign of Edward III.; but this was far more stringent in its provisions, and prohibited the bringing within the king's realm from the court of Rome or elsewhere any "sentences of excommunications, bulls, instruments, or any other things whatsoever which touch the king, his crown, or his realm; and that they which bring or receive them within the realm or notify or execute them shall be put out of the king's protection, and their lands and tenements, goods and chattels shall be forfeited to the king, and they shall be brought before the king and his council to answer for the same." This act, which plainly affirmed that the kings of England have no earthly superior within their realm, was looked on as a grievance at the court of Rome; but no formal censures against it seem to have been made till about 1429, in the reign of Henry VI., when the nuncio of pope Martin V. was imprisoned for delivering some of his master's letters, which we may suppose contained matters prejudicial to the crown. The pope broke out into a violent remonstrance, called the act an "execrable statute contrary to reason and religion," and said that without "speedy reformation it was to be feared some heavy judgment would be drawn down upon the English." We shall speak more of the statute of *Præmunire* presently.¹

We return to Wycliffe, who was only silenced for a time, as he again protested in his old style against the friars, transubstantiation, indulgences, &c. In consequence of repeated notices from the pope, he was brought up before his ecclesiastical superiors a second time, when he appears to have explained away some of his opinions; and, as he retained the protection of powerful friends, he fell under no penalties.² The preaching of Wycliffe was popular, and he had obtained great influence among the people of England. Many of his tracts remain—preserved by his followers in the midst of persecution, and they plainly direct the hope and faith of Christians to that truth which can alone sustain the soul. When the land was full of papal privileges, purchased indulgences, bulls, &c., with what force must such words as these have sounded in the people's ears: "Look well to the charter of heaven. Study well the meaning of that bull; for the pardon thereof shall endure for ever. Do you ask what is the charter of this heritage, and the bull of this everlasting pardon? It is the name of our Lord Jesus

¹ Collier, vol. iii., p. 210. Massingberd, p. 254.

² Milner, p. 595.

Christ. . . . Our charter is sealed with his blood. . . . The print of this seal is our Lord upon the cross. . . . Lock not this charter in thy coffer, but set it in thine heart.”¹ But that which endeared Wycliffe to the people even more than his preaching was his translation of the Bible; for the English had as yet no entire version in their own language. The gospels had all been translated into the Anglo-Saxon tongue some centuries before this time, as also had many books of the Old and New Testament; but the old language had become so greatly changed by the admixture of Norman words that the word of God had become as a sealed book to the people. By this great and good work of Wycliffe’s an eager appetite for Scriptural knowledge was excited; those who could not procure more of the Scriptures would give much for a few favourite chapters; they would hide the treasure under the floors of their houses and do anything rather than give up the coveted possession. Wycliffe’s translation, which was published A.D. 1380, was not from the original Hebrew and Greek, but from the Latin; and as printing was not yet in use, the cost of copying was great.² It was not immediately denounced, but was condemned by archbishop Arundel, A.D. 1408. The grounds on which the objection was made were, not that it was wrong to read the Bible, but wrong for unauthorized persons to put out their versions of it. This objection, however, would have been best proved by publishing a duly authorized version. It has been stated by a Romanist writer (Sir Thomas More) that the clergy kept no Bibles from the laity but such translations as were not approved; but though reading the Bible may not have been absolutely prohibited, the difficulty of obtaining an approved translation was so great that Wycliffe’s Bible, or portions of it, had for its readers the charm of a new possession.

The doctrine of transubstantiation had never been formally received by the English Church, but from the time of pope Innocent III. and Stephen Langton, archbishop of Canterbury, it had never been questioned. Wycliffe, however, denied that it was the primitive doctrine, and asserted that it had not been held for the first thousand years after Christ; and the year after the publication of his Bible he openly expressed these opinions at Oxford and attempted to persuade the duke of Lancaster of the truth of his doctrine. But that prince, though favourable to diminishing the power of the prelates, had no inclination to engage in this controversy, and the reformer therefore withdrew to Lutterworth. Meantime his opponents took resolute measures to suppress his doctrines. A synod was held at the house of the black friars in London in May, 1382, when it was declared heresy to deny the doctrine of transubstantiation. It was perhaps thought dangerous to imprison a man so popular as Wycliffe; but Richard II. was persuaded to issue a

¹ From a MS. in the British Museum, quoted in Massingberd’s *Reformation*, p. 127

² Massingberd, p. 130. *Sketch of the Reformation in England*, by the Rev. J. J. Blunt, pp. 94, 130.

proclamation by which he and those who maintained his opinions were banished from Oxford. He was summoned to Rome by pope Urban VI., but from an attack of palsy was unable to obey. It is said that on one occasion, when Wycliffe was dangerously ill at Oxford, some of the friars, hoping the prospect of death would alarm him, desired him to revoke what he had taught against them. He requested his attendant to raise him on his pillow, and sternly replied, "I shall not die, but live to declare still further the evil deeds of the friars."¹ Wycliffe was assisting at the celebration of the Holy Communion at his parish church of Lutterworth, A.D. 1384, when he was seized with another stroke of palsy, and he died on the last day of that year.

This reformer is blamed by historians, and with justice for his desire to uproot rule and order in the Church. Not content with pointing out and endeavouring to correct the errors that prevailed, he interfered with matters that did not concern him. One writer says that some of his opinions were erroneous, and some were dangerous in their moral and political consequences.² His inestimable work in translating the word of God into the English tongue deserves our lasting gratitude, for it opened the eyes of hundreds to the false doctrines which then filled the Church. There are few men whose character has been more variously estimated. It has been thought strange that he escaped imprisonment and died quietly at his rectory; but it has been shown that he had protectors who were high in power, and we have seen that his enemies succeeded in driving him from Oxford, and intended to bring him to Rome, when a merciful Providence gave him a better summons. Others have wondered why he did not quit the Church since he found so many antichristian practices in her communion. But he never professed to think it the duty of any Christian to leave the Church; he would have reformed her, but would not have set up a rival communion, and he did his utmost in raising his voice against the corruptions that prevailed.³

The first wife of Richard II. was a Bohemian princess, and Wycliffe's writings seem to have been carried into that country by one of her attendants. From the perusal of these writings John Huss took up those opinions for which he suffered martyrdom, and prepared the way for Luther. Richard's queen protected the followers of Wycliffe while she lived, and her memory was so dear to the people that long after her death she was called the good queen Anne.

An idea had arisen, and had for some time prevailed, that the Scriptures were intended only to be studied by scholars and the clergy; and a learned contemporary of Wycliffe complained that by his translation he had laid the gospel more open to the laity and to women who were able to read than it used to be to the most learned

¹ Massingberd, p. 180—143. Southey's *Book of the Church*, p. 205.

² Southey, p. 207.

³ Massingberd, p. 144—148.

of the clergy, and thus the gospel pearl was cast abroad and trodden under foot.¹

The famous William Wykeham, bishop of Winchester, was a contemporary of Wycliffe. When he was made bishop, during the reign of Edward III., the king is said to have remarked that he did not consider him to be a sufficient scholar for the appointment; to which Wykeham replied that, though he was but a moderate scholar himself, he would take care to make a great many good ones. The noble school at Winchester, which he founded A.D. 1387, has well fulfilled this promise. He also built and endowed New College in the university of Oxford, and was buried in the fine old cathedral of Winchester, the nave of which was erected by him.²

During this century there appeared to be some prospect of a reconciliation between the Greek and Latin churches, and the Eastern patriarch went to Rome A.D. 1367 to negotiate the matter, but the century was spent in fruitless debates.

The discourses of John Duns Scotus had induced the university of Paris to adopt the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary about the beginning of this century. This doctrine was controverted by the Dominicans, and a warm dispute ensued.³

The reign of Richard II. ended disastrously to himself, as he was obliged to abdicate the throne, and was imprisoned in Pontifract castle, Yorkshire, where he was murdered. His first cousin, who was the son of John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, and had been the instigator of the rebellion, succeeded him as Henry IV. A.D. 1399. In the reign of Richard II. a law had been passed that all those who held Wycliffe's opinions should be imprisoned; but in that of Henry far severer proceedings were sanctioned, as he was the first English king whose laws authorized the burning of men as heretics. The spirit of persecution by which the Albigenses and Waldenses had suffered so greatly during the last century on the continent of Europe had now reached this country, and many during this and the succeeding reigns suffered this cruel martyrdom; and as far as it appears, the first person who was put to death by burning was William Sawtree, the parish priest of St. Osyth, in London. He denied transubstantiation and other popish errors, and was burnt as a heretic A.D. 1400.⁴

The system of impropriations, which began with William I., had grown so rapidly that more than a third part of the benefices in England had become such. An attempt was made to check the evil in the reign of Edward I. by the statute of mortmain, but it was evaded in many ways. The example of the monasteries in procuring impropriations was followed by colleges, hospitals, &c., and each learned the art of procuring them. The monks often used their influence with the lord of a manor to make over the church on

¹ Southey, p. 208. Milner, p. 606.

² Collier, vol. ii., p. 268.

³ Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 501.

⁴ Collier, vol. ii., p. 262.

his estate and the tithes with which it might be endowed to their own abbey, on their undertaking to provide the minister who was to fulfil the duties. Thus rectories were reduced to vicarages; the greater tithes going to the abbey fund, the small tithes left as a poor pittance to the priest, who took the labours of the parish under the title of *vicarius*. This invasion of the rights of their pastors disgusted the people; the tithes were alienated from their original purpose, but were still in clerical hands, and there was no precedent for a layman to be an impropiator until the time of Henry VIII.¹

The followers of Wycliffe were called Lollards, and many of their political opinions were subversive of discipline both in Church and state. It would not be fair to impute all their extreme notions to Wycliffe, yet they are the natural consequence of some of those principles which he taught, and it is not surprising that a party of increasing numbers holding tenets which were unfavourable in many points to a monarchical government and an episcopal Church should be regarded with suspicion; but the persecutions and burnings of the Lollards, which took place between Wycliffe's death and the Reformation, were on account of their religious tenets, though the accusation of disaffection to the state was put forward in some instances as being the more popular charge.² The doctrines of the Church of Rome had now been engrafted on the English Church, and the Lollards were pursued with unrelenting rigour for their opposition to those doctrines.

Arundel, archbishop of Canterbury, took very strong steps against these "heretics." He held a synod at Oxford, A.D. 1408, which prohibited the reading of Wycliffe's books and his translation of the Bible under pain of excommunication, and this prohibition was extended to any future translation by any unauthorized person. It was directed that as the doctrines of the Lollards had penetrated the university of Oxford, the heads of colleges should inquire into the opinions and principles of their students with a view to admonishing them if wrong, and, if obstinate in the same, to expel them. One of the decrees passed enacted that no person should dispute about anything contrary to the articles of belief settled by the Church, especially with regard to the worship given to the cross, the image of our Saviour, and the images of the saints, and it was decreed "that the regard paid to relics, the customary processions, kneeling, bowing, incensing, lighting up tapers, pilgrimages, and other marks of religious respect, be publicly taught and maintained" . . . and "that whoever teaches and maintains the contrary shall incur the penalty of a heretic."³

In the year 1410 Wycliffe's books were publicly condemned and burnt in the university of Oxford; but this only caused his opinions to gain ground, and his books were more valued than before.⁴

In this reign arose the last insurrection of the Welsh. Owain

¹ Blunt's *Reformation*, p. 63.

² Collier, vol. iii., p. 252. Blunt, p. 90.

³ Collier, vol. iii., p. 278—282.

⁴ Collier, vol. iii., p. 287.

Glyndwr, descended from the ancient princes of that country, was attached to the cause of Richard II., and became involved in quarrels with one of the lords marchers. Henry IV. took the part of the latter, the Welsh that of Glendower; and, as Henry had offended the powerful family of the Percy's, they joined in the year 1401 with the Welsh chief, and a serious insurrection arose, which was quelled after much bloodshed. Glendower died 1416, and his son Meredydd made his submission to the king. Quarrels between the Welsh and the lords of the marches still continued, but nothing serious occurred after Glendower's death.¹

¹ Woodward's *Wales*, p. 565—575.

CHAPTER XX.

CENTURY XV.

COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE, A.D. 1414. RIVAL POPES AND COUNCILS.
SIR JOHN OLDCASTLE. HENRY VII.

HENRY IV. died 1413, and was succeeded by his son Henry V. In 1414 the council of Constance was held, to which several deputies were sent by the convocation of the English Church, including the bishops of London, Salisbury, Bath, and Hereford. John Huss, who like Wycliffe had distinguished himself for denouncing the Romish errors and corruptions in his native country, was invited by pope John XXIII. to attend it; and Sigismund, emperor of Germany, gave him a safe conduct both for going and returning. When he appeared, many propositions which were brought forward from his books were condemned, and he himself was questioned and accused of holding Wycliffe's doctrines and teaching them in the university of Prague. At this council Huss had many enemies, and as his defence was considered unsatisfactory, he was condemned as a heretic and suffered martyrdom at the stake in July, 1415. This unpardonable breach of faith, after the bestowal of a safe conduct by the emperor, added to the iniquity of the act. The council attempted to justify it by stating that the safe conduct given to heretics by temporal princes was no bar to the jurisdiction of the Church, and that an ecclesiastical judge, duly authorized, might punish the persons prosecuted, notwithstanding they came to the council or other church tribunal purely upon the strength of such safe conduct. While Huss was in prison, his intimate friend Jerome of Prague was cited to the council. Jerome had travelled much, was a master of arts at several universities, and had been in England, from whence he brought some copies of Wycliffe's books to Prague. When he found that Huss was imprisoned, he endeavoured to escape, and make his way back to Bohemia; but in this he failed, and after Huss was executed, Jerome was prevailed upon by the council to abjure his errors and make a recantation. His persecutors, however, were resolved he should not escape, and charged him with insincerity. He retracted his recantation, was condemned as a "heretic relapsed," and suffered death with great fortitude a year after his friend Huss.

The Bohemian nobles highly resented the barbarous execution of their countryman, John Huss, and protested in a letter sent to the council of Constance, that they knew not for what reasons he was condemned, as he was a very honest good man and explained the Holy Scriptures and constantly exhorted to peace and charity.¹ They also complained of the cruel treatment of Jerome, and said,

¹ Collier, vol. iii., p. 313. Milner, p. 644.

“We are resolved to sacrifice our lives for the defence of the gospel of Christ and his faithful preachers.”

The council of Constance passed a decree against giving the communion to the laity in both kinds; the practice of denying them the cup in the holy eucharist had gradually crept in, but had not been positively forbidden until now.¹

The doctrine of transubstantiation caused this denial of the cup to the laity on the ground of reverence, lest any of the sacred wine (or blood) should be spilled. The eucharist was now looked on as a sacrifice of the real body and blood of Christ offered by the priest. The reservation of the host (or sacramental elements) followed in due course. In the primitive Church it had been reserved for the communion of persons who were absent from sickness or some other unavoidable cause; but from this period it was placed on the altar for worship. The Holy Communion, scarcely remembered as a means of grace, was looked on as a sacrifice offered by the priest for sin; and the practice arose of people being present as worshippers without partaking. Thus did this blessed sacrament become gradually changed into the sacrifice of the mass.

The council proceeded to examine and condemn Wycliffe's tenets, and to anathematize his person and memory; and, in order to make the sentence more solemn, directed that his remains, if they could be distinguished, should be dug up and burnt. In accordance with this decree and an order sent by pope Martin V. for its execution, his grave in the chancel of the church of Lutterworth was opened, the bones were taken out and burnt to ashes, and the ashes thrown into a neighbouring brook called the Swift. “This brook,” says Fuller, the Church historian, “conveyed his ashes into Avon, Avon into Severn, Severn into the narrow seas; they into the main ocean, and thus his ashes are the emblem of his doctrine which now is dispersed all over the world;” or, as it has been quaintly expressed,—

“The Avon to the Severn ran,
The Severn to the sea;
So Wycliffe's dust was borne abroad,
As wide as waters be.”

And Foxe, the historian of the martyrs, says Wycliffe was in the three elements of earth, fire, and water, by which they thought utterly to extinguish his name and doctrine for ever.²

This council had been expected to effect some reformation in the pontiffs and clergy by checking the despotism of the former and the luxury and immorality of the latter, and therefore the eyes of Europe were fixed upon it. But the cardinals and higher clergy employed both art and eloquence to prevent this proceeding, and

¹ Collier, vol. iii., p. 319.

² Southey's *Book of the Church*, p. 229. Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, vol. i., p. 529. Massingberd, p. 180.

amongst other pretexts asserted that a work of such consequence had no prospect of success until a new pontiff was chosen. Great dissensions had been caused during the commencement of this century by rival factions and rival popes; but about A.D. 1417, pope Martin V. was elected, and soon made it appear that he was resolved that neither the clergy should be reformed nor the Church restored to greater purity.

The council of Constance was dissolved A.D. 1418, and five years later the council of Basle was called, in which two great points were proposed to be deliberated; the re-union of the Greek and Latin churches, and the reformation of the Church as regarded its head and members. Eugenius IV. was now the pope, and being as unwilling as his predecessor that any reforms should be carried out, a warm contest ensued between him and the council, who eventually elected another pontiff. But Eugenius held another council at Florence, and the Church was scandalized by schism and rivalry, there being now not only two rival pontiffs but two contending councils. The attempts made at Florence to heal the schism between the Greek and Latin churches, though aided by the anxiety of the former to enlist the Latins in their cause on account of the danger they were in from the Turks, proved unsuccessful, the main point insisted on being that the pope was the supreme judge and true head of the universal Church. Constantinople fell into the hands of the Turks A.D. 1453, and Christianity was crushed in that portion of Europe. The council of Florence was closed A.D. 1442, and that of Basle the following year. We have touched but slightly upon the matter of rival popes and councils, as not directly concerning the English Church, yet we cannot entirely omit mention of them as they help to elucidate the Church history of this period; especially as the English prelates were mostly in the interest of pope Eugenius, and must have had some share in the transactions of the council of Florence.¹ The higher ecclesiastics in England seem to have become more and more subservient to the papal see, and the monastic houses might be reckoned amongst its devoted adherents.

In England persecution was carried on during the reign of Henry V., as it had been during that of his father. Sir John Oldcastle, lord Cobham, who held the opinions of Wycliffe, openly opposed the abuses of popery, and collected and dispersed the works of the reformer. Archbishop Arundel was one of his bitterest enemies; but Sir John was a favourite of both king and people, and his high position made him formidable. Henry, wishing to save him from the consequences of heresy, used many arguments to induce him to renounce these opinions. "You," said the gallant knight, "I am ever ready to obey, but to the pope I owe no obedience." Henry's mind became prejudiced against Cobham on account of his partiality for the Lollards, whereby he had also incurred the resentment of the great body of the

¹ Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 538—544. Collier, vol. iii., p. 372.

clergy. The archbishop now summoned him from Cowling castle, his seat in Kent, to appear before him; but he refused admission to the messenger, and on his second refusal, Arundel excommunicated him. Lord Cobham, alarmed at the approaching storm, presented a confession of his faith to the king; but the latter ordered it to be sent to the archbishop, and in the end Cobham was arrested and committed to the tower. On being examined by Arundel, he gave an account of his faith, stating that every man who would be saved must forsake sin with true contrition; that he who renders worship to images which is due only to God is a grievous idolater; that a man may spend all his days in pilgrimages and lose his soul at last; but that he who knows the holy commandments of God and keepeth them shall be saved, though he never visited the shrines of saints. Arundel said he was not sufficiently plain as to other articles of belief, and especially warned him regarding the doctrine of transubstantiation, stating that the faith of the holy Church is that after the sacramental words are spoken in the mass "the material bread that was before bread, is turned into Christ's very body, and the material wine that was before wine is turned into Christ's very blood;" also that Christ ordained St. Peter to be his vicar here on earth, whose see is the holy Church of Rome, and he granted that the same power which he gave St. Peter should descend to all his successors, whom we now call popes of Rome, and whom Christians ought to obey after the laws of the Church of Rome. The unscriptural notions and the superstitions of the Church at this time are here strikingly shewn.

Lord Cobham replied that in the holy sacrament is both the body and the blood; the bread is the thing we see with our eyes, but the body of Christ is hid, and only to be seen by faith. "The day passes away," said Arundel, "you must either submit to the ordinances of the Church or abide the dangerous consequences." By "the Church," the archbishop meant the doctrines and errors which had been introduced from Rome. "My faith is fixed," said Cobham, "do with me what you will." He was then pronounced to be a pernicious detestable heretic, and condemned as such. He said, "Though ye condemn my body, I am well assured ye can do no harm to my soul." Then he knelt down and prayed for his enemies saying, "I beseech thee, Lord God, to forgive my persecutors, if it be thy will." He was taken back to the tower, but granted a respite of fifty days. It is supposed that the king still retained a regard for Cobham, who had formerly distinguished himself by his military talents, and his general popularity exposed those who had been his judges to much odium. Whether this delay in carrying out the sentence was caused by the lenity of the king or the caution of his accusers is uncertain, but he remained a few weeks in the tower, till at length by some unknown means he made his escape, and contrived to reach Wales, where he remained concealed for four years.¹ The accusation of treason was afterwards added to

¹ Milner, p. 614—620. Foze, vol. i., p. 638.

that of heresy, lord Cobham having been represented as heading an insurrection of the Lollards in St. Giles's Fields in 1414. It appears that the king had received information, on which he relied, that Cobham had conspired with a large number of his party to seize the royal person and overthrow the government. Henry, who was at the palace at Eltham, hastened to London and proceeded with his troops to St. Giles's Fields, where he dispersed some stragglers who were found there, and took some Lollards prisoners, who were all executed. An immense reward was then offered for the capture of Cobham, who was outlawed, and the charge of conspiracy and treason was fully believed. At length, in 1417, he was taken prisoner by Lord Powis, brought to London, and condemned, as a traitor and a heretic, to be hanged in chains and burnt to death. The king was at this time following up his successes in France after the battle of Agincourt. The designs of Cobham and his party is a matter of conjecture; it is possible that the persecuting laws of the house of Lancaster may have led the Lollards to join in that wish for a change in the reigning family, which was beginning to appear in many quarters. It is certain that lord Cobham in the early days of his persecution had displayed the humility of a Christian as well as the spirit of a soldier, and that he possessed the regard and confidence of his sovereign. It seems probable, therefore, that the ill treatment to which he was subjected drove him into those measures for which his memory has suffered obloquy.

Whether the assembly in St. Giles's Fields was really an insurrection may be questioned, but the result was fatal to the cause of the Lollards. Whenever any treason was brooding or any disturbance occurred, it was connected with rumours of Lollard insurrections; but the manner in which the executions of the Lollards was carried into effect—namely, by fire, which was considered the appropriate punishment of heresy—shews that it was really upon that ground they were condemned. It has already been said that many of their opinions were politically dangerous, but if they ran into extremes they had some cause and excuse for so doing: they were not straining at gnats, but at camels. The personal corruption of the priesthood led them to question its authority; but these reformers, though mistaken, were not mercenary, and were constant to their opinions in life and in death.¹

A desire to study the Scriptures had been aroused by their translation into the native language; but as copies could only be multiplied by the expensive and slow process of writing, their cost was beyond the reach of very many. Portions or chapters could, however, be obtained and the people would sit up at night with their doors shut for fear of surprise, reading or hearing others read the word of God. The price of one of Wycliffe's Testaments in 1429 was equal to nearly forty pounds of our money, but this translation

¹ Milner, p. 620. Blunt, p. 92.

was very instrumental in preparing the way for the reformation of the Church of England.¹

War with France had been the chief occupation of Henry V., and brilliant victories had crowned the arms of England. This king married a French princess, and the birth of his son was celebrated by great rejoicings in London and Paris. At this point, when his glory seemed to have reached its height, he was seized with a fatal illness and died A.D. 1422, being succeeded by his infant son Henry VI. The house of commons gained an important point during this reign, that no law should be enforced unless it had received their assent. At no time were supplies of money more freely granted, as the king had dazzled the eyes of his people by his victories. The widow of Henry V. married a Welshman, Sir Owen Tudor, who was descended from the ancient princes of Wales, and by him she had two sons, of whom Edmund, the eldest, was created earl of Richmond. The family of Tudor afterwards mounted the English throne, and the Tudor princes bore the red dragon of Wales as a supporter of their arms by virtue of their descent from Cadwaladr, sovereign of Wales. Henry's succession to the throne caused great satisfaction to the Welsh.

Henry VI., being an infant, the affairs of the kingdom were managed by a council, at the head of which was Humphry, duke of Gloucester, who bore the title of 'protector of the realm.' The conquests which had been gained in France were lost, and, as Henry grew to manhood, his weakness of character became very apparent. The great supporters of the house of Lancaster were the duke of Gloucester, and his uncle, cardinal Beaufort, bishop of Winchester. They died within a few weeks of each other, and Richard duke of York, who was descended on his mother's side from the second son, and on his father's from the youngest son of Edward III., began to aspire to the throne. Henry VI. had married Margaret of Anjou, a high-spirited princess, and a son had been born to him; but the duke of York had matured his plans which were greatly aided by the king's weakness, and in 1455 the famous wars of the roses began. They were so called from the badges of the royal armies, the house of York having adopted a white rose as its ensign, and that of Lancaster a red rose. All England was now divided into two great parties, and the miseries of a civil war desolated the kingdom. In 1460 York publicly laid claim to the throne and Henry VI. was made prisoner, but queen Margaret called the Lancastrian lords to her side, and the red rose triumphed for a short time. The duke of York was slain in battle, but his party was not dispirited, for his son Edward succeeded to his title and claims, and in 1461 was proclaimed king with the title of Edward IV.

The wars of the roses were however not yet ended. Henry was a prisoner in the tower, but the high-spirited Margaret and the famous earl of Warwick again raised the ensign of the red rose.

¹ Berens's *History of the Common Prayer*, p. 21. Blunt, p. 95.

The decisive battle was fought at Barnet, A.D. 1471, when Warwick was killed. Henry's young son, Edward, was taken prisoner after the battle of Tewkesbury and put to death. Henry met a similar fate in the tower on the day of the triumphal entry of Edward IV. into London; and the unhappy Margaret returned to France.

The reign of Edward IV. is distinguished by the introduction of the art of printing into England. William Caxton, a Kentish man, learned and to some extent practised the art in Holland in 1473, and in 1476 set up a printing press in Westminster.¹ Scotland received the press in 1508, and Ireland in 1551. Posts were now first used in England; horsemen were stationed twenty miles apart; and dispatches were passed on at the rate of a hundred miles a day between London and Scotland.

Some account of the affairs of that kingdom must now be given. In the reign of Henry IV., a young Scottish prince, son of king Robert III., was taken prisoner by the English on his way to France, and detained for some years in Windsor castle. In 1423 this prince ascended the Scottish throne by the title of James I.; he was anxious to improve the system of government and to abridge the power of the fierce and haughty nobility, but the nation was unprepared for these improvements, and he was assassinated in 1437 by some of his nobility in the presence of his queen. The Scottish ecclesiastics, both secular and regular, had by this time employed so many devices for enriching their various abbeys and other foundations that a very large part of the Scottish lands had been transferred to their hands. But the field was not yet prepared for the seed of reformation; and a priest named Resby, who had adopted the sentiments of Wycliffe, and crossed the Tweed to preach his doctrines to the Scots, was pronounced guilty of heresy and committed to the flames. In the reign of James II., Kennedy, bishop of Dunkeld, was elected bishop of St. Andrew's, and on his translation to that see effected a great reformation in his diocese both by his own example and a revival of ancient discipline. He founded the college of St. Andrew's and settled a large revenue upon it, and dying in 1466 was succeeded by his nephew, who visited Rome during the pontificate of pope Sextus IV. Hitherto the archbishop of York had been considered the metropolitan of Scotland; but this arrangement had been found very disadvantageous to the Scottish Church, inasmuch as when the two countries were at war, which frequently happened, the Scots were unable to lay their appeals before the archbishop. The Scottish Church was therefore now declared independent of the see of York; St. Andrew's was made an archbishopric, and Glasgow shortly afterwards received the same distinction. Considering the unfriendly relations between the two countries, it seems surprising that this change had not been sooner made.²

Edward IV. died 1483, leaving two sons, Edward—who succeeded

¹ Powell's *Short History of the Art of Printing in England*, 1877, p. 11.

² Russell, vol. i., p. 131. Collier, vol. iii., p. 406.

him as Edward V., and Richard duke of York; also several daughters, of whom the eldest, Elizabeth, was afterwards married to king Henry VII.

Edward V. was about thirteen years old when his father died, and his uncle Richard duke of Gloucester was made protector of the kingdom. This prince, forgetful of the ties of blood and the feelings of humanity, usurped the throne in a few months as Richard III., and caused the young king and his brother to be murdered in the tower. There was, however, a strong party against Richard, and a union of the houses of York and Lancaster was now proposed by the marriage of Henry Tudor, earl of Richmond, grandson of Sir Owen Tudor, and great grandson of John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, and the princess Elizabeth of York, eldest daughter of Edward IV. In August, 1485, Henry Tudor landed at Milford Haven, marched through Wales, and met Richard at Bosworth, where the latter was killed. This was the last battle fought between the houses of York and Lancaster. Henry made his public entry into London two months afterwards and called a parliament to secure his title to the throne, which he claimed by inheritance and conquest; and in order to close the jealousy of the rival houses he married Elizabeth of York.

During the first fifteen years of the reign of Henry VII., his throne was threatened by many plots, the most noted of which was that headed by Perkin Warbeck, who pretended to be the young duke of York, who had been murdered with his brother Edward V. in the tower. His claims were countenanced and supported by James IV. of Scotland, but the plot was suppressed, and Warbeck was hanged at Tyburn. The old enmity between England and Scotland was set at rest for a time by the marriage of the Scottish king in 1503 to Henry's eldest daughter Margaret, which was the source of the union of the two crowns a hundred years later. The king's eldest son, Arthur, was married to the princess Katherine of Arragon, and died six months afterwards. Henry's great vice was avarice, but during his reign peace was preserved, many useful laws were passed, and the foundation of our commerce was laid. In this reign America was discovered, and in 1497 a Portuguese, Vasco di Gama, doubled the Cape of Good Hope, thus opening a way by sea to India.

Henry died A.D. 1509, and was buried in the splendid chapel in Westminster abbey erected by himself, which to this day bears his name. He was succeeded by his son Henry VIII. Margaret, countess of Richmond, mother of Henry VII., founded St. John's college, Cambridge, about 1508. Eton college and King's college, Cambridge, were founded in the reign of Henry VI.

CHAPTER XXI.

CENTURY XVI.

HENRY VIII., A.D. 1509. COMMENCEMENT OF THE REFORMATION.

HENRY VIII. was eighteen years of age on his accession to the throne. A Lancastrian on his father's side, and a Yorkist on his mother's, he united the claims of the rival families. As a Tudor, he had Welsh blood in his veins, which circumstance assisted to bring about in the principality a better feeling towards England. A bull from the pope had given Henry permission to marry the princess Katherine, widow of his brother Arthur, and the marriage took place during the first year of his reign. We are now approaching the important period of the reformation of religion, but before commencing that subject it may be well to take a short review of the causes which led to it in this country, and of the political movements which had in a great measure changed the state of society.

The policy adopted by the Norman sovereigns of England—as we have before related—was to place the Anglo-Saxons in a state of vassalage and serfdom under their own followers, since by depriving the former of their lands in order to enrich these bold and unscrupulous knights, they not only lowered the power and influence of the native nobility, but attached the new possessors to their person and throne, and placed them in a position to assist their sovereign in case any insurrectionary movements should take place amongst the ancient owners of the soil.

The arbitrary conduct of the Norman kings, however, gradually alienated the barons, and caused a more kindly feeling to arise between the latter and the Anglo-Saxon race. The love of liberty so strongly implanted in the heart of our Saxon forefathers found a response in that of their lords; and the bold barons of England, aided by their vassals, obtained the famous Magna Charta from the weak and tyrannical king John. The nobles, intoxicated by power, became exacting and factious, and were too often engaged in insurrections against their sovereign. In the meantime the commons of England were making themselves known, and their parliamentary representatives were gaining privileges and influence. In the towns were the tradesmen who supplied the wants of their countrymen; in the counties the stout yeomen whose skill as archers made them so formidable in the battle field. The lesser nobles and knights were beginning to fill the place now occupied by the landed gentry of England. The power of the great nobles was checked during the wars of the roses, and may be said to have been broken when the earl of Warwick, called the king-maker, fell at the battle of Barnet in 1471. He has been termed by one of our great novelists, “the last of the barons.” Henry VII. and the

Tudor sovereigns who succeeded him were fully sensible of the danger which would arise to the crown, should the power of the great nobles be revived; and they succeeded in curbing and restraining it.

Education was no longer despised or considered the exclusive right of ecclesiastics, and the art of printing placed advantages within men's reach which were eagerly sought after.

The condition of the peasantry did not however improve with the times. Their state of serfdom was suitable enough to the early feudal system, when they were under the protection of the lords of the soil, although they were exposed to much oppression and the poet's words were too often exemplified,—

“That they should take who have the power,
And they should keep who can.”

But if the sons of the labourer were really little better than serfs under the feudal system, they were well fed and cared for: in field sports master and man met on an equality; the cottagers on a festive occasion had a welcome in the castle; the landed proprietor, when he did not regard his people's welfare, neglected his own interests.¹ But as the feudal system was dying out, its abuses became apparent and the state of the people was intolerable. The rebellion headed by Wat Tyler, in the reign of Richard II. in 1381, and its sudden extension through a great part of England, was a proof of the misery and oppression which the lower classes experienced. Hitherto they had derived no benefit from the advance of civilization, and their condition of extreme dependence became obnoxious to them.

We have shown how the tyranny of the early Norman kings and their interference in the affairs of the Church induced the principal ecclesiastics to throw themselves more into the hands of the pope for protection; but when the encroachments of the papacy became too great and its exactions too exorbitant, we found the kings, the bishops, and the nobles protesting against its usurped authority in the most spirited manner. The power of granting or withholding dispensations for marriage, which the popes obtained and exercised, and the influence, which the enforced practice of private confession gave to the priesthood, assisted to alienate the higher ranks of society. The want of religion, and the extremely lax morality which prevailed throughout Europe during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, were deplored by many wise and good men, who endeavoured in different ways to stem the torrent of superstition and to reform the abuses of a corrupt Church. The increasing honour and reverence paid to the Virgin Mary had risen to acts of worship; and the assertion that she had been conceived without sin was in the fifteenth century made an express declaration by pope Sextus IV., who published an edict in 1476, in which he granted indulgences to all those who

¹ Dean Hook's *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, new series, vol. iv., p. 91.

should celebrate an annual festival in honour of the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin.¹

Monasteries greatly increased in number after the Norman invasion. Men who had been guilty of deeds of cruelty and rapine sometimes became conscience stricken and endeavoured to make their peace with heaven by bestowing lands for the endowment of these religious houses. The monastic clergy induced many patrons of church livings to part with the patronage and bestow it on their monasteries. They also obtained appropriations of rectories by special deed, which deeds made the endowments of parish churches, both in lands and tithe, monastic property. The abbots frequently abused the trust so reposed in them, and presented to vacant churches men who could but just read the services, giving them a miserable stipend. These men were called by the people Sir John Lack-Latin or Mumble Matins, &c. Pope Gregory VII. (the famous Hildebrand) had desired that all church services should be conducted in Latin; and as this was a language not understood by the people, they were little edified by the prayers.²

It must, however, be allowed that whatever learning had been preserved in England during these ages, found a home in the monasteries. Amongst the Benedictines especially, were to be found those who kept the chronicle of their times and registered the annals of our country. The monks of Westminster, St. Alban's, Croyland, Glastonbury, and others are men to whom we owe the records of the past. We must not forget the learned diligence of William of Malmesbury, or the patience and patriotism of Matthew Paris. From the time of Edward I. towards the close of the thirteenth century, the founding of monasteries declined, and their fall in popular estimation was caused by the idleness and profligacy which prevailed amongst many of their inmates. The more enlightened of the bishops and statesmen founded colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, and many of the splendid cathedral churches which beautify our land were rebuilt or restored in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.³

Of the many errors which had overlaid the truth of the gospel by this time, we may name, besides the worship of the Virgin already mentioned, prayers to saints, masses for the souls of the dead in order to free them from purgatory, the denial of the cup to the laity, and the belief that the body and blood of our Lord were actually present in the holy sacrament. The neglect of holy Scripture, the ignorance of the people respecting it, and the conducting of all church services in an unknown tongue, were the mainspring and cause of these deadly heresies.

As the people became more enlightened, the thinking portion of the community saw that true religion was dimmed by outward observances and superstitious errors, and the better disposed among

¹ Mosheim, vol. ii., p. 569.

² Churton's *Early English Church*, p. 356. Blunt, p. 64.

³ Churton, p. 384. Massingberd, p. 76.

them no doubt yearned for a purer and more earnest faith; but the causes which most hastened the Reformation were the translation of the holy Scriptures, and the discovery of the art of printing which multiplied the copies of God's word. But if many were agreed on the necessity of reform, they did not yet see the principles on which it should be conducted. The country was ripe for the movement, and only wanted authorized leaders to guide it in the right direction.

No prince had ascended the English throne with the popular feeling more strongly in his favour than Henry VIII. Only forty years had passed since the civil war of the roses had spread misery and bloodshed throughout the land, and the sad memories of that time still lived in men's minds. The young king was, therefore, hailed by all parties as one who was to bury these disputes for ever. He was handsome, accomplished, and skilled in all the manly exercises of the age, and his learning was such as would have raised him to distinction, had he been in humbler life. He found the country at peace, the kingdom prosperous, trade flourishing, and his treasury full. The splendour of his court exceeded any thing that had been seen in Europe; the royal authority was firmly established. His reign is remarkable not only for the reformation of the Church, but for the revival of learning and the number of eminent men in England and Europe. Three remarkable sovereigns were the contemporaries of Henry—Francis I., king of France, Charles V., emperor of Germany and king of Spain, and Leo X., pope of Rome, who was elected in 1513. This eminent man possessed refined tastes, and was a liberal supporter of learned men and devoted to splendour and luxury. These qualities led him into expenses which emptied his treasury, and this together with his anxiety to complete the erection of the cathedral of St. Peter, which had been begun by his predecessor Julius II., induced him to have recourse to the sale of indulgences—the most profane of all the means used by the see of Rome for obtaining money. We have previously alluded to this practice, which was now carried to an enormous extent. It was first heard of in the eleventh century, when indulgences were granted which gave to those who had visited certain churches or holy places, a remission of the penances which had been imposed upon them. Subsequently they were granted to the crusaders or to those who aided the crusades with money. The course pursued was most injurious to morality, but it brought large sums into the papal treasury. It was asserted that the power to grant indulgences had been committed to the head of the Church by Jesus Christ, and that the use of them was efficacious towards obtaining salvation. It need scarcely be said that few were found willing to undergo severe penance when they could commute it by payments. The popes, and under them the bishops and clergy, especially the Dominican and Franciscan friars, had this dispensing power. Leo's principal agent for the disposal of indulgences was the archbishop of Metz, who selected John Tetzel, a Dominican friar, as the person to effect their sale to the people.

Tetzel had been previously employed by pope Julius II. for the same purpose, and now, assisted by the friars of his order, he renewed the arts which he had formerly used, boasting that he had saved more souls from hell by his indulgences than St. Peter had converted by his preaching. In the form of absolution written with his own hand, the forgiveness of all sins, past, present, and to come, was assured; and with regard to the effect of indulgences in delivering souls out of purgatory, the declarations of Tetzel in public are well known:—"When the money tinkles in the chest, your father's soul mounts out of purgatory." These indulgences were sold by the gross to the highest bidder, by whom they were retailed to the multitude.¹

Such proceedings disgusted many eminent members of the Roman Church, amongst whom was the German monk Martin Luther. This celebrated man, born in Saxony in 1483, was a monk in the monastery of Erfurt, and afterwards professor in the university of Wittenberg. While at Erfurt he eagerly studied the Latin Bible, and in 1517 commenced writing against the shameful traffic in indulgences, having previously spoken in public on the subject. Luther was an eloquent preacher, and his powerful invectives from the pulpit at Wittenberg materially assisted the storm that was rising against the papal doctrines. Leo X., little observant of the signs of the times, remarked, "Brother Martin is a man of very fine genius." In 1520 Luther published his *Tract against the Papacy*, and shortly afterwards his *Babylonish Captivity*. He had now not only drawn the sword, but had thrown away the scabbard; and in June, 1520, Leo issued a bull of excommunication against him, requiring the German princes to apprehend him, and condemning his books to be burned. Luther, undismayed, raised a pile of wood outside the walls of Wittenberg and committed the decretals, the canon law, and the bull to the flames together. This would formerly have been an act of madness; but public opinion, which was fast gaining strength, was with the reformer. The bull was torn in pieces at Erfurt, and was ill received everywhere. Frederic, the elector of Saxony, was Luther's constant protector, while the rivalry which existed between Francis I. and the emperor Charles V. diverted the attention of those sovereigns from the progress of these opinions.² Luther did not carry on this warfare alone. He was aided by Melancthon, Ecolampadius, and Erasmus, while Zwingli and Calvin raised their voices in Switzerland, and the reformer Beza joined in the work in France. Thus men's minds were aroused and their attention called to the necessity of purifying the catholic Church from its corruptions. But it was only in England that the work of reformation was prosecuted by the heads of the Church and state; and the great Anglican community has been thereby blessed and made a blessing to the world.

¹ Milner, p. 664. Soames's *History of the Reformation*, vol. i., p. 116.

² Blunt, p. 99.

We must now return to the affairs of our own country. Thomas Wolsey was the most prominent figure during the first twenty years of Henry's reign. He had risen to the deanery of Lincoln in the reign of Henry VII., and in that of Henry VIII. attained the rank of archbishop of York and chancellor of England; he then became a cardinal, and in 1518 was created papal legate. He was the son of poor people at Ipswich, and owed his rise chiefly to his talents. The king was naturally extravagant, and fond of amusement, which the cardinal encouraged, knowing that the affairs of the state would thereby fall into his own hands. He obtained great influence over the young king by the readiness he showed in ministering to his wishes.

When the news of the reforming movement in Germany reached England, Henry undertook to write a book in defence of the Romish doctrines, and sent a copy of it to the pope. Leo, much gratified at this illustrious aid, bestowed on him the title of defender of the faith, which title is borne by our sovereigns to this day, though now in defence of a purer and more enlightened faith. The letters F.D., for *Fidei Defensor* may be seen on all our coins. Henry's work showed considerable learning and talent, and he was much pleased by the applause it received. Luther replied to Henry, and the attention of Europe was directed to the controversy. The principles of the Reformation were now gaining ground in England from a variety of causes. Erasmus had passed some time here before the end of the last century, and his genius and learning had spread its influence amongst teachers and students. The Greek language, which had scarcely been understood by more than one or two in a century for many ages, was now earnestly studied at the universities; and the holy Scriptures were begun to be read in the original tongues. Among the friends of Erasmus was the "ever-memorable dean Colet," as he has been justly called, the founder of St. Paul's school in London. About 1498, he first revived at Oxford the practice of reading lectures upon Scripture. When he was made dean of St. Paul's, his preaching there, and also in Buckinghamshire, where he had a church, was much frequented by those who had inherited the principles of the Lollards, and he did not escape the suspicion of what was then called heresy. Colet promoted the study of Greek, and to those who pursued it the investigation of the Scriptures became a favourite pursuit. This good man discouraged both by words and actions the veneration for images and relics; and aware that ignorance is the parent of superstition, he nobly devoted the ample fortune which he inherited from his father to the endowment of St. Paul's school, at which sound learning under able instructors was freely given. This school still remains as a monument of his liberality. Colet fell under suspicion, but archbishop Wareham was too good a man to encourage the accusations made against him. The dean did not live to see the Reformation, which he so earnestly desired, as he died in 1519.

That which was carried into effect by Colet at Oxford was also

done by George Stafford, divinity lecturer, at Cambridge,¹ and it was through his influence that our noble reformer Latimer was induced to study Scripture. The principal leaders of the reforming party in England were not men who had merely adopted the opinions which prevailed amongst the followers of Wycliffe: they were men who thought for themselves and "searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so." Acts xvii. 11. They saw the necessity of reformation in the Church; and the introduction of printing enabled them to spread their views amongst their countrymen. The cause derived considerable strength from the publication of the New Testament in English. This important work was performed by William Tyndal, who was born on the borders of Wales. He studied at Oxford and Cambridge, and became tutor in a gentleman's family. Here he met with those who frequently discussed the opinions of Luther and Erasmus; and, being a man devoted to learning and zealous for the truth, he spoke so freely that it was deemed advisable for his own sake and that of the family with whom he resided that he should leave them. At this time he had formed the intention of translating the New Testament from the original Greek; for the language of Wycliffe's version, which was only a translation from the Latin, had become obsolete, and the book itself had been prohibited. Tyndal required assistance and funds, and obtained both from a rich and benevolent citizen who was himself inclined to the principles of the Reformation. He then went to Germany, had a conference with Luther, and settled at Antwerp, as the best place for printing his book and sending it to England. Tyndal was convinced that his countrymen could not be settled in the truth unless they possessed the Scriptures in their mother tongue. When it was discovered that copies of this translation were dispersed and bought in England, Tostall, bishop of London, purchased the remaining copies, as well as all those that he could collect from private hands, and burned them at St. Paul's Cross. This edition being disposed of, several others were published in Holland before the year 1530. On one occasion Sir Thomas More, who was then chancellor, inquired of a person who was imprisoned for heresy how Tyndal subsisted abroad, and who were the persons in London who helped and supported him; to which the man replied, that it was the bishop of London who maintained him by sending money to buy his Testaments. It is said that the agent employed was a friend of Tyndal, and when he told him he had got him a merchant for his Testaments, "Who is he?" asked Tyndal. "The bishop of London," said his friend. "That is because he will burn them," said Tyndal; "but be it so, I shall have money to print more, and the whole world shall cry out upon the burning of God's word." And thus it happened in England, for the people reasoned that there must be something contrary to the New Testament in the doctrines of

¹ *Sketch of the History of the Church of England*, by bishop Short (late of St. Asaph), p. 82—84. Massingberd, p. 238.

those who thus treated it. In 1531 Tyndal was imprisoned, and in 1536, was put to death near Brussels, on which occasion he repeatedly and earnestly prayed, "Lord, open the king of England's eyes."¹

Henry VIII. was now to become the means of humbling the papal power in this country. It has been stated that his marriage to his brother's widow had been sanctioned by a papal dispensation. Queen Katherine had borne him several children, of whom none survived but the princess Mary, and exceptions had been taken to an alliance with Mary on the ground of her being illegitimate. Henry, who had now been married eighteen years, began to feel scruples of conscience as to the validity of his union with Katherine, and wished for a divorce. It was highly desirable that there should be a direct heir to the throne, for the miseries of a disputed succession were not forgotten; but whether we are to give Henry credit for real scruples or not at first, it is certain that he had afterwards other reasons for wishing to be released from his union with the queen, as he had fallen in love with one of the ladies of the court, the beautiful Anne Boleyn. In the year 1527 application was made to the pope to declare the king's marriage void. Clement VII., if willing to gratify Henry, was unable to do so at that time, as the emperor Charles V. was in possession of Rome; and Katherine being his aunt, the pope could not venture to displease him, as Charles had resolved to uphold the legality of her marriage. Wolsey, it is said, advised the pope to proceed, warning him that he would lose England if he did not comply. Katherine was urged to renounce her claims and retire to a convent; but being attached both by interest and affection to the papal authority, she declared that only the same power which had allowed her marriage should dissolve it. Henry waited two years for the pope's decision, and his impatient temper chafed at the delay. At length it occurred to him that the best way to force the pope to agree to his wishes was to show that he was inclined to throw off his authority. By reference to history and the laws of the country he ascertained the independence of his crown, but he little thought while thus acting for his own private purposes, that he was an instrument in the hands of Providence to bring about a mighty reformation.²

Wolsey was suspected of acting a double part respecting the divorce, appearing openly to urge it, but secretly delaying it in obedience to the pope. This remarkable man had now attained to the zenith of his greatness; he was possessed of immense wealth, and the splendour of his establishment and retinue rivalled that of the king; but while his position pleased the people, from whose ranks he had risen, it excited the anger and envy of the nobility, and the more so as it was combined with extreme arrogance and haughtiness of manner. Thus when the divorce was delayed, and the king's anger was turned towards Wolsey, his fall was rapid. Under his administration the disorders of the clergy had been repressed,

¹ Southey, p. 247. Berens, p. 21—23. ² Massingberd, p. 249.

men of worth and learning were promoted in the Church, libraries were formed and the study of Greek and Hebrew introduced at Oxford; but the doctrines and practices of the Church, Wolsey took as he found them, though he removed its ignorance and reformed its manners.

The archbishop's fall was as great as had been his rise. He was deprived of his office of chancellor, forced to give up his palaces and wealth, and desired to retire to his diocese of York, to all of which he quietly submitted, hoping by that means to soften the feelings of the king towards him. He was finally arrested on a charge of high treason, which appears to have been a plot of his enemies at court, and on his way back to London he fell ill, and died at Leicester, in 1530. On his death-bed he made use of these memorable words, "If I had served my God as diligently as I have served my king, he would not have given me over in my gray hairs." Cardinal Wolsey was a remarkable instance of a man who rose from the humblest class by his own industry and talent to as great a height of worldly glory as a subject is capable of.¹

As the divorce may be considered in a great measure the cause of Wolsey's fall, so was it of the rise of Cranmer. Thomas Cranmer, who was born at the family seat of Aslacton, in Nottinghamshire, in 1489, was educated at Cambridge. Whilst pursuing his studies there, his attention was called to the proceedings in Germany; and finding himself not qualified from his ignorance of Scripture to form a correct opinion of the questions debated, he diligently studied the Bible, and in order to obtain a thorough acquaintance with it he learned the Greek and Hebrew languages. Cranmer prosecuted his studies with great industry for some years, reading the works of the Greek and Latin fathers, and examining the decrees of councils and every branch of theology. He became divinity lecturer, and was appointed by the university to examine candidates for degrees. If he found them wanting in knowledge of the holy volume, he refused to recommend them as fit persons for the honour. This proceeding was disapproved by the monks and friars, but Cranmer was not deterred by their complaints, and many of those whom he rejected, afterwards acknowledged his justice and the benefit they had derived from it by being induced to further study. It so happened that Cranmer, whose talents were well known, got into conversation, respecting the divorce, with two of the bishops, who asked him his opinion upon it. He replied that he had not thoroughly examined the question as they had done; but one thing only had to be considered, whether the marriage was allowed by the word of God; on this matter learned divines were the competent judges, and by the opinion of such persons the cause should be decided. When the remark was repeated to Henry he replied, "I perceive that this man hath the sow by the right ear;" and sending for Cranmer he insisted on his looking into the matter himself.²

¹ Southey, p. 238. Massingberd, p. 257.

² Soames's *Reformation*, vol. i., p. 217.

The subject was submitted to several universities and many learned divines in Europe, and replies favourable to the divorce were received from many of them. The universities of Oxford and Cambridge and the convocation of the Church also considered the question, and were of opinion that the marriage was unlawful. The dispensing power of the pope appears to have been the only claim that could be advanced for its legality; and when that power was disputed, the divorce was a natural consequence. It is impossible not to sympathize with the queen who had been Henry's faithful wife for so many years.

Wareham, archbishop of Canterbury, died in 1532, and Cranmer succeeded to that high position.

The convocation of the English Church took so important a part in the changes that were now approaching that it is necessary to give some account of it. It was an assembly of the clergy which came into existence after the Norman invasion. By the constitution of the Church, every bishop may convene his clergy to a diocesan synod, and every archbishop may summon the bishops and clergy of his province to a provincial council, while a general council, assembled from the whole of Christendom, represents the catholic or universal Church. The bishops in England have the power, like all other catholic bishops, of calling such assemblies; but the sovereigns by degrees adopted the practice of requiring them to call their clergy together, not to a purely ecclesiastical synod, but to a meeting connected with the parliament, and exercising some temporal functions. These assemblies of which there were two, one for the province of Canterbury and one for York, obtained the name of convocation. They voted all the taxes which were paid by the clergy, so that the monarch had an interest in their meeting; and as they were called together by the archbishops, as well as by the king, and were able to exercise all the functions of a synod, the practice of calling any other councils had almost fallen into disuse, especially as they were discouraged by the popes. Thus the convocations of the two provinces, which always sat at the same time as the parliament, came to be recognized as the synods of the English Church.¹

Our Church had always maintained her independence, though she had been brought into conformity with Rome in doctrine and practice. She had repeatedly disputed the right and authority of the pope, which had never been constitutionally settled here. The royal supremacy was now established and was the turning point of the English Reformation; for by this principle the Church was left free to admit the alterations in religion which followed. It had long ago been contended by the English parliament, and admitted by the English clergy, that their king had no earthly superior in his dominions. It was so clearly the law of the land that the clergy could not deny it; and so when Henry demanded that they should acknowledge him as the head of their Church, no one could

¹ Massingberd, p. 259.

refuse to admit it in the sense in which it had already been admitted; but knowing the king's arbitrary character, the clergy feared a wider interpretation. It is one thing to say that no laws shall be made without the consent of the sovereign; it is quite another to allow that he shall make such laws as he pleases in religious matters; and it was in this latter sense that the clergy dreaded the royal supremacy. The king did not require that they should formally pass any resolution on this point, as if it were a new thing; but in voting the subsidy, he required that they should acknowledge him to be the sole protector and head of the Church. After three days this acknowledgment passed in the convocation of Canterbury with the addition of the words "as far as is consistent with the law of Christ;" and with this limitation it was signed. Some months afterwards a similar declaration was made by the convocation of York; but Tostall, now bishop of Durham, protested against it. It is not surprising that the clergy should dread the king's arbitrary power, as he had proved it by threatening them with the pains and penalties of *Præmunire* for having acknowledged Wolsey as the pope's legate, whereas several English archbishops had acted as pope's legates since the making of that statute without any prosecution from the state.¹

Henry did not forgive the papal see for all the delays that had occurred in the matter of his divorce. It had so incensed him that he was resolved still further to curtail the power of the pope in England, and this project fell in with the wishes and feelings of a portion of his subjects. In the meantime his union with queen Katherine having been declared null and void by the archbishop of Canterbury, his marriage to Anne Boleyn took place. The proceedings at Rome continued to increase the resentment of the king, who was pronounced excommunicated for his marriage with Anne Boleyn, while his union with Katherine was declared to be valid.

The statute which had been passed by parliament in 1532, prohibiting appeals to the pope, was directed to be fixed to the church door of every parish. By this act all appeals to Rome of what kind soever were prohibited, and those who made them were to be brought under the statute of *Præmunire*, which statute in fact put an end to papal supremacy in this country.

The annates, or first fruits of bishoprics, which had been paid to the see of Rome, were now forbidden, and notice was taken by parliament of the vast sums of money which had been taken out of the kingdom by these contributions; a sum of no less than £160,000 sterling between the second year of king Henry VII. (1486) and the time now referred to (1531) having been thus expended. The persecuting statute of Henry IV. had been so far repealed that persons could no longer be burned for heresy unless they had been tried in open court and detected by two lawful witnesses at the least.²

¹ Massingberd, p. 260. Collier, vol. iv., p. 175.

² Collier, vol. iv., pp. 186, 236. Also pp. 207, 226.

The election of bishops was now considered. We have said that election by the laity as well as the clergy was the usual mode of elevation to the episcopate in very early times throughout Christendom; but tumults arising, the emperors and other sovereigns took the appointments in some degree into their own hands, by reserving to themselves the right of confirming the elections, and of granting investiture of the temporalities which began to be annexed to this spiritual dignity. This right was acknowledged A.D. 773, by pope Hadrian I. and the council of the lateran, and it was exercised by Charlemagne and other Christian princes; but the court of Rome by degrees excluded the laity from all share in these elections, and confined them to the clergy, the mere form of election appearing to the people of little consequence while the crown was in possession of a negative voice which was almost equal to a right of nomination. Hence the right of appointing to bishoprics is said to have been in the crown of England, as well as of other European kingdoms even in Saxon times, the rights of confirmation and investiture being in effect a right of donation. Afterwards the popes objected to the method of granting these investitures by a ring and pastoral staff, pretending that it was an encroachment on the Church's authority and an attempt to confer spiritual jurisdiction. The disputes respecting investitures were mentioned in a former part of this history. The kings of England and other sovereigns agreed at length to receive only homage from the bishops for their temporalities instead of investing them by the ring and crosier. This concession was obtained from king Henry I. by the influence of archbishop Anselm.

Edward I. and Edward III. had both claimed the right of nominating bishops, but the formal elections had always been in the hands of the cathedral chapter; and the pope could therefore over-rule the choice, which for a long time he had done, appointing by his own provision, as it was called. In the compromise between king Henry I. and the pope with regard to the investitures, which had been arranged through the mediation of archbishop Anselm, the king surrendered his right to nominate bishops and promised to give the chapters a *congé d'élire*;¹ but he afterwards through his influence with the chapters contrived to retain the actual nomination. It was now enacted that the king should nominate to a vacant bishopric, granting to the chapter the usual license to elect, which is called *congé d'élire*; but, if the chapter should refuse to elect the person nominated, or the bishops refuse to consecrate him when elected, they should incur the penalty of the statute of *Præmunire*. It was at the same time forbidden that any bishop or archbishop should be presented to the pope for confirmation in his see. This act, which is still in force, abolished the usurped power of the pope, but did not restore to the Church the ancient power of electing her bishops. It is the first article in Magna Charta that the Church is to enjoy perfect liberty in its elections, a

¹ A license to elect a new bishop.

liberty which the great lawyer Coke declared to be most worthy to be retained.¹

Judge Blackstone explains the original meaning of the offence which the statute of *Præmunire* was levied against; namely, introducing a foreign power into the land by paying that obedience to papal decrees, which by the laws of the constitution belonged to the king alone centuries before the Reformation. In the time of Henry VIII., the penalties under this statute were extended to appeals to Rome from any of the king's courts, which, though illegal, had sometimes been connived at; the act also forbade suing for any license or dispensation, or obeying any process from Rome. The punishment of *Præmunire* is shortly summed up by Sir Edward Coke, that the guilty person is out of the protection of the crown, his lands and tenements, goods and chattels, forfeited to the crown, and that he shall remain in prison at the king's pleasure or during life.²

The clergy, assembled in both houses of convocation in 1534, renounced the pope's authority, and expressly declared "that by the word of God, he has no more jurisdiction in England than any other foreign bishop." This resolution was signed by a large number of the bishops, abbots, monks, and priests.

The annates, or first fruits of all benefices and spiritual offices, were granted by parliament to the king. It will be remembered that these payments were originally a papal usurpation, and they were now given to the king as head of the Church.³

Two good and learned men lost their lives upon the scaffold at this time—Fisher, bishop of Rochester, and Sir Thomas More. The former, who had been educated at Cambridge, was confessor to Margaret, countess of Richmond, in the reign of Henry VII., and induced her to found St. John's college at that university. He was much esteemed by the king until the business of the divorce and the pope's supremacy came to be discussed; but Henry would not tolerate any opposition on these points, and Fisher, being a strong advocate for the papal claims, was executed in 1535. Pope Paul III. thereupon issued a bull in which he admonished king Henry to repent of his crimes and appear at Rome in person or by proxy; and in case of refusal his subjects were commanded to withdraw their allegiance; all Christian countries were forbidden to hold intercourse and commerce with the English; the clergy were ordered to depart the kingdom, and the nobility and gentry were required to form themselves into an army, and drive the king out of his dominions. Foreign kings and princes were exhorted to treat Henry and his abettors as rebels to the Church, and to undertake a holy war against them; and in order to disentangle their consciences and encourage them the better, all their alliances and treaties of what kind soever with the king of England were declared null and void.

¹ Blackstone's *Commentaries on English Law*, ninth edition, 1783, vol. i., p. 377. Massingberd, p. 275.

² Blackstone, vol. iv., p. 115—118.

³ Collier, vol. iv., pp. 266, 267.

And for the better apprehending of those who stood firm for the king, it was set forth that whoever seized them might make slaves of their persons and appropriate their effects. The bishops were directed to excommunicate the king and his abettors publicly in their churches. This bull was ordered to be fixed on the doors of the principal churches of Tournay, Bruges, and Dunkirk.

The days were, however, gone by when such threats from the papal see could injure the sovereign and people against whom they were levelled; but their utterance shewed the spirit which animated the popedom, and these menaces were fatal to Sir Thomas More, who was brought to his trial and executed on Tower Hill in July, 1535. More, who had been lord chancellor, was a man of learning and genius, and, like bishop Fisher, he was exemplary in his private life. In his celebrated book *Utopia* he seemed to uphold liberty of conscience, but he failed to carry out those principles later in life, for he was no gentle adversary to the Lollards and Lutherans.¹ This did not appear to proceed from a cruel disposition; but the disturbances in Bohemia and the disorders of the Anabaptists in Germany had probably given him an aversion to any changes in the Church.

William Tyndal had lost his life in the cause of truth, but Miles Coverdale, who had assisted him in his work of translation, published the whole Bible in English in 1535, and the following year the English clergy were directed to have a copy of the Bible in Latin and in English in their churches, that those who liked might "look and read therein." The sacred volume was bought by those who had the means to do so, and where the cost was too great for one individual, neighbours and apprentices would join and buy one between them.

On Cranmer's motion, convocation voted an address to the king for an authorized English translation of the Bible—an act worthy of the Church which was now no longer to wait for the consent of a foreign bishop to its measures of reformation. Gardiner and his party vehemently opposed it, alleging that the indiscriminate use of Scripture in the vulgar tongue only tended to heresy. The king was persuaded to assent through the influence of his queen Anne Boleyn, who favoured the reformed doctrine and ventured to possess a copy of Tyndal's interdicted translation. The work was accomplished about four years later, and a preface, written by Cranmer, was added to it: it was called Cranmer's Bible, or the Great Bible.²

We now come to the dissolution of the monasteries, which was one of the most tyrannical of Henry's acts, notwithstanding the evils for which those houses had become notorious. Of the two motives which appear to have actuated him in this proceeding, the first was that several of these houses had failed to comply with his wishes on the subjects of the supremacy and the divorce; the

¹ Collier, vol. iv., p. 271—281.

² Berens, p. 23—25. Blunt, p. 188.

second was the prospect of a war with the emperor Charles V., for which, and for the extension of commerce consequent upon the discovery of America, money was much needed.

In order to make the fall of the monasteries unpitied the king sent certain commissioners to take a strict account of their proceedings and expose their misbehaviour, and they exerted their powers to the utmost. The strength of the papacy lay in the monastic orders, and above all in the mendicants or friars. The secular or parochial clergy were better subjects, but the monks were a most powerful body, and many of them paid special allegiance to the pope, to whom they were more loyal than to the king. The privilege of being independent of the bishop's authority which the popes had bestowed on many of the monasteries was the cause of several irregularities and contrary to primitive discipline. The bishops had remonstrated on the subject with the papal court. The state of public feeling towards the religious houses had been in some degree indicated; for whilst no abbey or priory had been founded for thirty years and upwards, the endowments of schools and colleges was becoming more and more frequent. Henry began with the lesser monasteries for many reasons. They were the houses of the friars who were the most faithful of the pope's servants; and as they did not stay at home like the monks, they had the power of putting whatever opinions they entertained into extensive circulation; and besides, the fate of these lesser houses did not affect the more powerful classes of society, since younger sons were provided for in the wealthy abbeys. This was a war upon the weak (so far as property was concerned), and was a measure which prepared the way for a greater one, not yet avowed—the suppression of all the monasteries and convents, great and small. In the year 1536, three hundred and seventy-six of the smaller abbeys fell, but there was now a pause. The king probably waited to see the effects of this blow, while at the same time he was much absorbed in domestic concerns. His jealous temper caused him to suspect Anne Boleyn of being unfaithful to him, and she was brought to trial, and beheaded in 1536.

The greater monasteries had by this time taken the alarm. In 1539 the king's visitors were again sent forth, and six hundred and forty-five of these houses shared the fate of their lesser brethren. Their property was not found to be so great a booty as was expected, for they had turned all they could into money, foreseeing the storm which had burst unawares upon the others. A vast number of persons were thus turned out upon the wide world; crime increased, for many were deprived of all means of subsistence, and some were made desperate by want. Bad as the monasteries were reported to be, and bad as in many instances they were, they had yet their redeeming qualities. It was found that they had been the refuge for the destitute, who were now driven to great extremities throughout the kingdom; they had been the almshouses for the aged dependant, the decrepit servant, the decayed workman, who all found there a home; they had likewise been infirmaries for the

sick, and inns for the wayfaring man, who heard from afar the vesper-bell which invited him to repose and devotion. The monks were accused of covetousness, yet no legal provision for the poor was wanted so long as the property was in their hands; but it was shortly afterwards found necessary to make such a provision, and rates for the relief of the poor were established early in the reign of queen Elizabeth.¹

The popular feeling which at first had been against the monasteries and their inmates, took part with them in their adversity; for, in spite of the vice and idleness of many, there were noble exceptions, and their hospitality and charity merited the affection which was felt for them by a large portion of the community, more particularly by the poor. Sympathy was especially felt for the inmates of the nunneries, in which the unmarried daughters of the gentry often found a refuge, and the kind deeds of the nuns had endeared them to the needy and destitute. The people now saw them turned adrift with a small pittance, and they felt the loss of the usual charities. These proceedings therefore caused great excitement, and insurrections took place in consequence in many parts of the kingdom.

Parliament passed an act by which all the religious houses dissolved or to be dissolved were conveyed to the king and his heirs; and Henry in order to bind the nobility and gentry to him promised them large shares in the spoils. This was done by the advice of Cromwell, the king's minister and visitor-general of the monasteries, who told his master that the parcelling out of the abbey lands amongst a great many proprietors was the only way to make a final settlement of the business. The monasteries and abbeys, with the land and tithe belonging to them, were therefore disposed of, at a low price, to the courtiers, nobility, and gentry, and in some instances were given gratuitously, and thus arose the *lay appropriations*. This act of spoliation greatly injured the cause of the Reformation. Moderate Romanists stood aloof, when they saw manors and townships which had been dedicated to the use of the Church given to laymen, and that because they had renounced the pope. Had the English laity not enriched themselves with these spoils, the Reformation would have had a clearer complexion in the eyes of Europe.² The suppression of the monastic houses and the distribution of their lands among the gentry, or the second nobles, to use Bacon's expressive phrase—for the ancient nobility were too diminished to share much in the plunder—gave them a vast increase of wealth and influence. A great middle class was also rising, and as land came into the market and the rich men in the cities purchased it, they too often forgot the duties which landed property brings, in their anxiety to become landed proprietors. Many became purchasers of abbey lands and church property and let them at the highest rents. The people felt the

¹ Collier, vol. iv., p. 307—309. Blunt, p. 135—143.

² Collier, vol. v., pp. 16, 21. Massingberd, p. 296.

change of masters. In place of the old chiefs they found a landlord, who wished to obtain the greatest amount of work for the least amount of pay. In the monasteries the franklins or farmers often gained a free education for their children, and were able through this means to see them rise to eminence, and gain the dignity of a prelate of the Church; but the new purchaser of the abbey lands gave no thought to the farmer and the poor.¹ It is true that the dissolution of these religious houses broke the power of the pope in England, as it was chiefly through them that he gained such an ascendancy in this country, and it is also true that the monks had greatly encroached upon the rights of the parochial clergy by the appropriations which they had obtained, amounting at this time to more than one-third of all the parishes in England; but it is a serious blot upon the Reformation that these were not restored to their proper channel, instead of being handed over or sold for a trifling sum to laymen.

Neither Cranmer nor his friends approved of these proceedings. They were willing that the abbeyes of royal foundation should return to the crown, but wished the foundations of the rest to be applied to the endowment of colleges for the education of clergy, the founding of grammar schools, and the erection of hospitals and almshouses. Not one of these benefits, however, was carried out by public authority, though some were effected by private benevolence. Had the abbeyes been turned into public schools and seminaries for learning, into provisions for disabled soldiers and seamen, for the poor disabled by labour and age, for orphans and widows, and other charitable purposes—if even half the monasteries had been thus disposed of, their loss would not have been regretted,² and the wishes of the original donors would have been respected; for their bounty would still have been devoted to the glory of God and the benefit of their fellow-men. How large a portion of the tithes were thus alienated from religious use is evidenced to the present day, and the result is shewn in the miserable maintenance too frequently reserved for the vicar, while the lay impropriator owns and benefits by the tithes which were originally intended for the service of God's ministers.

The chantry lands and chapels, which were usually united to some parochial or cathedral church, had been endowed for the support of one or more priests to pray for the souls of their founders, &c. They were now suppressed and placed in the king's hands; but as he left money in his will to have prayers offered up for his soul, his suppression of these chapels seemed inconsistent, and the author whom we quote quaintly remarks, "as popes took money to let souls out of purgatory, so king Henry took land one would almost think to keep them in." In the next reign a further act was passed to suppress these chapels.³

¹ Dean Hook's *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, new series, vol. iv., p. 91.

² Collier, vol. v., pp. 22, 26.

³ Collier, vol. v., pp. 149, 238.

A law regulating the appointment of suffragan bishops, or coadjutors in the larger bishoprics, was now made, which was the revival of an old custom of the Anglo-Saxon period. It was provided that any bishop who wished for an assistant, or suffragan, might present two persons for selection, and certain places were named as sees for such bishops. This law is still in force, and suffragans have been appointed of late to assist the bishops of some of our huge overgrown dioceses.

Some little progress was made in the foundation of more bishoprics. Five were founded, but this fell very short of the scheme suggested when the monasteries were suppressed. At that time the king proposed that thirteen new bishoprics should be founded from the funds of various abbeys, so that the size of some dioceses might be reduced to a more reasonable compass, and the primitive plan with regard to the bishop's inspection of their clergy might be better followed; but this noble design proceeded no further. The archbishop wished for Greek, Hebrew, and divinity lectures in order that many should be brought up to learning in the cathedrals, and that the bishop might thereby have a sort of seminary wherewith to furnish his diocese, but the king had parted with too much of the abbey lands to have the means of thus benefiting religion.¹

By the publication of the *Primer* an advance had been made towards having the public services in the churches conducted in the English language. The preface states that it was customary for all Christians to learn the creed, the ten commandments, and the Lord's prayer by heart. The book contained these with explanations of them, together with several psalms, portions of Scripture, and short prayers, the *Te Deum* and other hymns, also the litany, nearly resembling that now in use, an exposition of the fifty-first psalm, and a discourse upon the passion of our Saviour. This book was printed in 1535.²

Gardiner, the noted bishop of Winchester, was the leader of the Romanist party, and a bitter enemy to all reformation. When Cromwell, Henry's chief minister, fell into disgrace, Gardiner's influence increased, and archbishop Cranmer was unequal to opposing this clever and unscrupulous politician. Gardiner, having secured his ascendancy, maintained it almost to the end of Henry's reign, and had powerful assistants in the Romish cause in the influential Howard family. There was at this time an expectation of a general council being held for the settlement of religious differences, which might also have induced Henry to hesitate in proceeding further; and no man was better able than Gardiner to take advantage of any thing which favoured his plans. The duke of Norfolk now brought before parliament certain articles to be considered, which were afterwards passed, and called the *act of the six articles*; it was the death warrant of many innocent men. The

¹ Massingberd, p. 279. Collier, vol. iv., p. 268, and vol. v., pp. 48, 82.

² Collier, vol. iv., p. 313—320.

first article re-established the doctrine of transubstantiation; the second refused the communion in both kinds to the laity; the third forbade the marriage of the clergy; the fourth made vows of celibacy in the clergy obligatory; the fifth upheld private masses for souls in purgatory; and the sixth pronounced auricular confession to be necessary. The penalties for disobedience to these decrees were, for the first, to be burnt as a heretic; for the others, to be hanged, and in all cases to forfeit lands and goods as a traitor. Against these decrees the archbishop lifted up his voice in parliament for three days together, but in vain. The king's consent to these articles after his previous acts proves that his objections to Romanism were due not to its doctrines, but to the papal encroachments on his sovereign power. Henry, though uncertain and tyrannical, never forsook the archbishop, and in his hatred to the pope and his attachment to Cranmer did not change. He more than once saved the latter from his enemies, who tried to bring him under the operation of this act. On one occasion after telling him of the charges brought by his accusers, he gave him directions for establishing his own innocence and putting his enemies to shame. In another case the king sent for him at midnight to tell him that the council had demanded that he should be committed to the tower, as being one who encouraged heresy throughout the realm, and that the next day this was to be carried out. The king then gave the archbishop his ring, which in case of extremity he might produce at the council, and thus appeal to his sovereign. Cranmer did so and for a time escaped their vengeance.¹

Many people suffered death during this reign: Romanists who upheld the supremacy of the pope, such as bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More; others who fell victims to political causes, or to the personal jealousy or anger of the king; and finally those who were caught in this cruel net of the six articles. Many affecting stories of those days have come down to us—glimpses of the trials and troubles of an age when so many were called to bear the cross. Neither Cranmer nor other of the reformers were free from the general sin of persecution, and it can only be said that their acts were few compared with those of the opposite party, but toleration was then unknown. Men in those days thought that the souls as well as the bodies of the public should be protected, and they doomed to death both murderers and heretics—the slaughterers of the soul as well as the slayers of the body. Men at the present time indulge their malignant feelings against those who differ from them, but as the arrows they shoot are only bitter words, they see not the misery inflicted, which in sensitive natures is sometimes very great.²

We have now sketched the main points of the Reformation during the reign of Henry VIII. Our reformed Church was no

¹ Blunt, p. 168—170.

² Massingberd, p. 282. Dean Hook's *Lives of the Archbishops*.

new institution ; but was the same which had been planted in these islands in apostolic times ; it was the church of David and Dubricius, of Aidan and of Bede, endowed by the piety of our forefathers in very early ages. It was the Church which had protested against false doctrine and innovations both in British¹ and in Anglo-Saxon times, and against the usurped power of Rome in later ages.

There is a class of churchmen who hold very mistaken notions, and imagine that the endowments of which our Church is possessed became hers at the Reformation by being transferred to her from the church of Rome ; that, because Rome had obtained a power and authority over the doctrines of our Church, she had also obtained a right to her property ; and that our Anglican communion dates no further back than the reign of Henry VIII. As if a beautiful building hidden by rubbish was not the same building as when its fair proportions are restored to view, or as one of our divines beautifully expressed it, "The Church of England is as much the same church before and after the Reformation as a garden before and after it is weeded, or a vine before and after it is pruned."

It is asserted by our enemies that the reformed Church in England had her endowments made over to her by the state. We have shewn that these endowments were the gradual growth of centuries, from the early planting of Christianity in these islands, and that our Church was richly endowed in Anglo-Saxon times by princes,² earls, and thanes. The property acquired by the Church from the invasion of the Normans to the Reformation was chiefly that of the monasteries, of which she was deprived at the Reformation. Few people are aware of the amount which has been voluntarily given by members of the Church for church purposes during the last two hundred years, or of the continual liberality of her clergy as regards parochial and educational gifts. The English Church had been greatly impoverished by papal exactions as may be seen by referring to previous reigns, especially to that of Henry III. She still had to pass through severe storms, for the work of reformation was but begun.

Persecutions in matters of religion were now becoming frequent in Scotland. Cardinal Beaton, who was appointed archbishop of St. Andrew's in 1539, showed himself of a prosecuting disposition. Henry VIII. had a few years before sent Ferrar, bishop of St. David's, into Scotland with some books to present to his nephew, king James V. ; but that prince was not disposed to any reformation in religion. Henry afterwards wished for an interview with James, who was his nephew, but cardinal Beaton and the clergy were much averse to this, and persuaded the king to excuse himself to his uncle. James fell afterwards entirely under the management

¹ The Pelagian heresy.

² We see by the will of king Alfred and by that of Edward the Confessor that their gifts to the Church were their own private benefactions, not in any way belonging to the state.

of the cardinal and his party, and persons suspected of heresy were strictly prosecuted.¹

During this period, when the Reformation both in England and other parts of Europe had deprived the Church of Rome of a large portion of her spiritual dominion, a new religious order was founded by Ignatius Loyola, a Spaniard, who was born 1491. He was an officer in the Spanish army, and when he was severely wounded and laid on a bed of sickness, his thoughts having been turned to religious matters, he determined to devote his mind and body to the service of the Romish Church. The order thus founded received the sanction of pope Paul III., A.D. 1540, under the name of the Society of Jesus, better known as that of the Jesuits, and it was destined to play a greater part in the world's history than any which had preceded it. Its rules and regulations were different to those of the monks and friars, though its members were like them the devoted and obedient servants of the papacy. Ignatius was chosen general of the order, and framed its regulations both in the spirit of his former and his present professions—that is as a soldier, and as a servant of the Church. Obedience prompt and absolute was its basis. Vows of poverty and chastity were taken as in the other monastic orders; and to these were added a vow to proceed instantly to any part of the world to which the pope might send them. The Christian world was divided into provinces over each of which a president or provincial was to rule. The general, who was elected for life, assigned to each member of the society his duty and his station. Obedience to the order was to be given not only outwardly but by the mind and the will. The members were divided into different branches: those who were learning their profession, those who educated youth, and those who went forth as missionaries to the heathen. Over all these were the professors, who were few in number compared with the other classes. These were men of learning and prudence, deeply skilled in the affairs of the world; and those only were instructed in the secrets of the society who, after long experience and trial, were thought worthy of such an important trust. Such is a slight sketch of this remarkable order, from which the Church and court of Rome have derived more assistance than from all their other supporters and ministers combined. The variety of qualities and accomplishments possessed by the Jesuits, and their persuasive manners and conversation, not only gained for them the protection of statesmen and princes, but also acquired for them an immense influence over the minds of these great persons, to whom they frequently occupied the position of confessor. To promote the interests of the Church of Rome was their one great end—worked for with untiring patience and never lost sight of. As members of the dreaded Inquisition they strove with unflinching severity and unfaltering cruelty to stamp out what in their eyes

¹ Collier, vol. v., p. 56.

was heresy. Some of their principles were fatal to truth and uprightness, especially their detestable maxim that "the end justifies the means." We have spoken in the past tense, but such as this society was at its commencement such it is now, the zealous and unscrupulous advocate of papal pretensions and papal doctrines; and who can say, if the spirit of persecution were again revived, that its members would not be found amongst the most ardent of oppressors?

We cannot close this notice of the Jesuits without alluding to the zeal with which they laboured as missionaries in heathen lands. None acquired a greater reputation in this respect than Francis Xavier, who is commonly called the apostle of the Indians. In the year 1522 he sailed for the Portuguese settlements in India, and in 1529 passed into Japan. He wished to attempt the conversion of the Chinese, and died on his passage thither in 1552. The resolution and energy with which the Jesuits laboured in the mission field were worthy of a purer faith, and one cannot fail to admire their zeal and devotion.¹

Henry's last wife, Catherine Parr, ran some risk by entering into religious arguments with him. Gardiner endeavoured to draw the king into some proceedings against her, but failed, and lost a portion of his sovereign's favour by the attempt. The king died in 1547, aged 56; and when on his death-bed, sent for archbishop Cranmer, whose hand he pressed in his last moments. It is remarkable that this sovereign retained his popularity to the last, his uncertain temper and cruelty not having deprived him of the regard of his subjects. Much allowance must be made for his tyrannical and despotic acts, as his power was absolute, and his counsellors and parliaments submitted to his will in all things. His affability (in his better moods) and his lavish liberality were the qualities which probably endeared him to his subjects. He was the patron of art and letters; and it is to the example which he set of giving his daughters as well as his sons a learned education, that England is indebted for the women as well as for the men of the next generation. Of his domestic character little that is favourable can be said; he showed a hard heart and a jealous temper. He beheaded two of his wives and divorced two others; the only one he seemed to regret was Jane Seymour, who died at the birth of his son. Catherine Parr outlived him.

¹ Mosheim, vol. iii., p. 104. Sir J. Stephens's *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography*, No. iii., p. 100.

CHAPTER XXII.

CENTURY XVI.

EDWARD VI., A.D. 1547. THE COUNCIL OF TRENT. MARY, A.D. 1553.
PERSECUTION.

EDWARD VI., the son of Henry VIII., by his wife Jane Seymour, was only nine years of age when he succeeded to the throne; his amiable temper appeared in his conversation and manners, while his gravity and piety gained for him the name of the youthful saint. Possessed of great talents, and an understanding far beyond his years, his knowledge and learning were very remarkable. His uncle, the duke of Somerset, under the title of Protector, carried on the government. He favoured the reformed doctrines; and the young king was not only educated for his high station, but also taught the great truths of the gospel. At his coronation, when the swords of the state were brought to be carried before him, he observed that one was yet wanting, and called for the Bible. "That," said he, "is the sword of the Spirit, and ought in all right to govern us, who use these for the people's safety."¹

The Reformation proceeded, though plunder and havoc accompanied it; for they who had been dividing the spoil during the last reign were not content so long as any still remained. The protector was not deserving of that name as regarded the rights of the Church; he was fond of pomp and splendour, which led him into expenses and placed him amongst the foremost of the many plunderers. His palace in the Strand, which still bears the name of Somerset House, was built from the materials of two churches which he pulled down; but when his workmen were about to remove the church of St. Margaret's, Westminster, the parishioners rose to defend it, and drove them away.² The causes of these irreligious acts may be traced to the impostures and superstitions of former times, which had disgusted the minds of the nobles and gentry. Many had turned from superstitious credulity to a state bordering on unbelief, and were willing enough to gratify their desire for riches by the plunder of the Church's property.

Cranmer's temper did not incline him to revolution; his days were cast when a mighty change was passing over the minds of his countrymen. In that change, says the late bishop Wilberforce, he largely participated, and he is to be judged, like other men, by what he was, by what he affected, by what he let slip; he was sincerely religious, and a diligent student of his Bible; his mind slowly but surely received increased measures of truth as they were presented

¹ Soames's *History of the Reformation*, vol. iii., p. 2. Southey, p. 297.

² Massingberd, pp. 335, 370. Collier, vol. v., p. 323.

to him.¹ It was by degrees that he, Ridley, and Latimer laid aside the errors of popery, and not until they had examined and inquired by the light of Scripture, and of the Church in her purer ages. It was not till the close of Henry's reign that the archbishop gave up the tenet of transubstantiation, his opinion respecting it having been shaken by the arguments of persons brought before him for denying it. Had the work of reformation been conducted by the state as temporarily as by the Church, it would have been without reproach.

One of the first steps taken was to enjoin the clergy to dissuade the people from pilgrimages and image worship. Images which had been used for superstitious purposes were to be destroyed; this had, indeed, been previously commenced in some places. A register was to be kept in each parish of marriages, baptisms, and burials. Pulpits were to be provided. No person might preach unless he were licensed, and as men fitted to preach were scarce, they were permitted to read homilies instead. A volume called the First Book of Homilies was set forth; a list of its contents is to be found amongst the thirty-nine articles of our Church, and they are very plain and clear exhortations to a holy life. The Bible, as well as Erasmus's paraphrase of the New Testament translated into English, were directed to be set up in every parish church. The creed, Lord's prayer, and ten commandments were to be recited by the priest from the pulpit when there was no sermon.

The marriage of priests was made lawful, and the children of those who had married previously were declared legitimate.

Our present Church catechism was compiled at this time, which is by some supposed to have been done by Nowell, dean of St. Paul's; it was revised by Cranmer and Ridley, and no change of any consequence has been made in it since, excepting that the explanation of the sacraments was added in the reign of James I. This same year (1548) the cause of reformation was further advanced by the compilation of the office of the communion; and the primer of Henry VIII. was succeeded by the first prayer book of Edward VI., which was approved of by convocation and parliament, and directed to be used in all churches on the Whit-Sunday following. The moderation of the reformers is to be admired, for they did not reject those offices of the Church whose antiquity carried them back to very early times, because some corruptions had crept into them; but they corrected what was objectionable in doctrine, adding some happy expressions which gave a greater devotion to the passage; and their translation of the Latin prayers into English was so simple, so true, and so earnest that no more excellent version of ancient writings can be found than are afforded by the offices of our Church.² It was said of our Book of Common Prayer "that no man could mislike that godly book that had any godliness in him joined with knowledge."³

¹ Essays by Wilberforce, late bishop of Winchester, on the archbishops of Canterbury of the Reformation.

² Southey, p. 298. Blunt, p. 200—209.

³ Strype's *Annals of the Reformation*, 4to, second edition, 1725, p. 86.

The work of reform, as regarded rites, ceremonies, and tenets, had been carried as far as was then prudent, as was shown by the disturbances which took place, more especially in the distant counties, amongst those who were attached to the ceremonies if not to the errors of the Church of Rome.

The term 'mass,' as applied by the Romish Church to the Lord's supper, was superseded by that of 'Holy Communion,' or 'eucharist,' and the rite was administered in the same place in the Church as heretofore. It was, however, directed that, instead of the form of an altar, a plain table should be used on which the bread and wine should be consecrated. As some of these altars had been pulled down whilst others remained, an order was issued in the king's name that all should be removed and tables be placed in their stead. The reason given for this alteration was to avoid contest and misunderstandings, and it seems to have been necessary, to check the adoration offered to the elements. In the reign of queen Elizabeth this alteration was confirmed; and amongst other reasons given for the use of a table in place of an altar, one was that in the New Testament a table only is named, while old writers also use the term. The word altar is not employed in our Book of Common Prayer, though we now often use that word as well as table; the former on account of the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving there offered to God Almighty, the latter with reference to the supper of our Lord where our Saviour instituted this holy sacrament.¹

Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, who had been imprisoned in the tower for two years on account of his Romish tendencies, and his intrigues with the papal court, was deprived of his bishopric. Bishop Bonner also met with the same treatment for similar reasons.

The order respecting the removal of the altars afforded a fresh opportunity for pillage; and the halls of private houses were hung with altar cloths and other church furniture, though the friends of the Reformation raised their voices against it. The persons into whose hands the abbey lands had passed, engaged for vicars those who served for the lowest stipend, while the rents to be paid to themselves were trebled. Bishop Latimer, in his honest indignation, calls them 'step-lords.'² This irreligion was the fruit of former superstition and priestly tyranny; but there was yet another cause for the grievous sacrilege carried on in this and the preceding reign: many of the early reformers were followers of the opinions of Erastus, a German, who maintained that the Church should be wholly dependent on the state for its government and discipline. The young king had been brought up in these opinions, otherwise it would have been remarkable with his religious feelings that he showed so little disapproval of the sacrilege that prevailed. He speaks, indeed, in one of his papers of the "impropriation of bene-

¹ Collier, vol. v., p. 419.

² Massingberd, p. 878. Southey, p. 309.

fices" as a public evil which he wished to have remedied, but he seems to have had the idea that as king he was the fountain of all spiritual as well as temporal power. The dukes of Somerset and Northumberland were two of the greatest spoliators of the Church; both these noblemen died upon the scaffold, and Sir John Spelman, in his work on sacrilege, gives most numerous and striking instances of the misfortunes which have followed the families of those who sought to enrich themselves by their sacrilegious appropriation of sacred lands and goods. Somerset's brother represented to the king that the bishops ought not to be troubled with temporal concerns, and that it would be better for them to surrender their lands to his majesty and receive a yearly pension; but Edward rebuked him, saying, "There shall no such alteration be made while I live."¹

In 1547 Cranmer seems to have procured an order in council for a royal visitation of the dioceses to inquire into the discipline and religious practices of bishops, clergy, and people. He opposed to the utmost of his power the system of sacrilege and spoliation that was being carried on, and was desirous that the poor vicarages should be improved and education provided for; but the greediness and rapacity of those in power proved a barrier to his wishes.

The archbishop had invited some learned foreign reformers to England, and amongst them the wise and moderate Melancthon, by whom it had been suggested, many years before, that a general confession of faith should be agreed upon by all the reformed churches. Instead of Melancthon, however, came Martin Bucer, a German divine, and Peter Martyr Vermiglio, a native of Florence, both of whom had been originally members of monastic orders. Bucer had studied at Heidelberg, and in 1521 he first met Luther at the diet of Worms, where that brave man, in the presence of the emperor and states of Germany, made his public defence of his writings. It was on that famous occasion, when his friends tried to dissuade him from going, that Luther replied, "If I were sure to be assailed there by as many devils as there are tiles on the house-tops of the town, I would still venture my life among them." Bucer taught in different places in Germany with great repute; he came to England in 1548 and was made professor of divinity at Cambridge. Bucer regretted the desolate condition of the German reformed churches. He saw that the three orders of ministry were appointed in the beginning of Christianity, and he called it a device of Satan to destroy the order of bishops, that the churches might be given up to spoil. His error lay in being inclined to alter everything that had been wrongfully used in the Church, though he knew that it was not in itself wrong.

Peter Martyr had been prior of a convent in Italy, but, meeting with some writings of the Swiss reformer Zwingli, he gave up his preferment and went into Switzerland. His doctrine became more like that of Calvin than of the English reformers. When settled

¹ *The History of Sacrilege*, by Sir Henry Spelman. Southey, p. 307.

at Oxford, his influence was nearly as great as that of Bucer at Cambridge, but it was not altogether beneficial. He had not the quiet reverential temper of Bucer; he had not the same view of the dignity of the sacraments, nor the like regard to ecclesiastical order. But he was a man of learning and eloquence, and the beautiful address in our present communion office, intended to be used when the people are negligent to come, was composed by him. Another foreigner of less learning, but more turbulent zeal, was John, commonly called A. Laski, an exile from Poland. Melancthon says he was one of those who made him despair of concord among the reformed party.

The effect of this arrival of foreigners did not fulfil the designs or wishes of the archbishop. Instead of promoting union with the reformed churches abroad, it brought division into the Church at home.¹ Calvin and other foreign reformers were not disposed to let the English Reformation proceed in the manner most suited to the circumstances of the times and country, according to the judgment of those who had the best opportunity of deciding; but wished their own particular views to be adopted. John Hooper, who, with many others, had passed some years abroad in the reign of Henry VIII., during the time when the six articles were enforced, was appointed bishop of Gloucester through the interest of the duke of Northumberland with the young king. He objected to the episcopal robes which at that time were not, as now, of black satin mixed with lawn, but of scarlet silk, and this colour was to him the very livery of antichrist. Eventually he gave way, and was consecrated. Many Englishmen were induced to adopt the principles and doctrines of Calvin, and leaned to that very plain style of service which he and other Swiss reformers advocated. Cranmer's hopes of agreement with the foreign reformers were probably shaken; but in 1552 he wrote to Bullinger and Calvin, as well as to Melancthon, and stated that he was advising the king to call together a synod of the reformed churches in order to form a united confession of faith, in opposition to the decrees of the Romish council of Trent, and he asked their assistance and advice where the synod should meet—in England or elsewhere. The answer of Calvin was not encouraging, and the archbishop seems to have regarded the design as hopeless, and proceeded to the preparation of a set of articles of religion for the Church of England.²

Before proceeding further on this subject, however, it is desirable to give some account of the celebrated council of Trent, which was assembled in 1546 by pope Paul III., under the presidency of his legates, in consequence of the danger feared by the Church of Rome from the Reformation. The council was continued under the authority of succeeding popes, and its decisions were sanctioned by a bull of confirmation of pope Pius IV. Its doctrinal decisions have never been repealed, and they continue to be regarded as the sacred

¹ Massingberd, p. 353.

² Massingberd, p. 358.

oracles of the Church of Rome by all members of her communion. The council professed to assemble in order to correct and fix the doctrine of the Church, to restore the vigour of its discipline, and to reform the lives of its ministers. But in the opinion of those who examine things impartially this assembly, instead of reforming ancient abuses, gave rise to new errors and causes of complaint.

In the first place, as regards Scripture, the old Latin translation of the Bible, commonly called the Vulgate, was declared authentic, and no one was to presume to reject it; and all the books of the Old and New Testaments (including the Apocrypha), together with the unwritten traditions¹ which had come down, were to be received and revered with equal piety and veneration. This affected the foundation of all religious instruction, for in many of the matters that are controverted between the Romish and the reformed churches, the doctrines of the former are founded on tradition or some apocryphal book, or on the Latin translation of the Scriptures.

With regard to the doctrine of merit or justification, good works were declared to merit salvation—whereas Christ says, “When ye have done all that is commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants,” St. Luke, xvii. 10., and our eleventh article of religion says, “We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . and not for our own works or deservings,” &c.

The seven sacraments held by the Romish Church were enumerated; namely, baptism, confirmation, the Lord’s supper, penance, extreme unction, holy orders, and matrimony. In baptism it was declared that a total extirpation of the original sin of human nature is effected. The ninth article of our Church shows the different teaching therein contained. The council expressly declared that in the Lord’s supper or eucharist the body and blood of our Lord are contained truly, really, and substantially, and if any one shall deny “that wonderful conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which conversion, indeed, the catholic Church most aptly calls transubstantiation, let him be accursed.” The twenty-eighth article of our Church declares that this “cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture,” &c.

Again the council declared, “If any one shall say that Christ exhibited in the eucharist is eaten only spiritually, and not sacramentally also and really, let him be accursed.” Our twenty-eighth article says, “The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner.”

The council decreed the continuation of the administration of the bread only to the laity. Our thirteenth article declares that “the cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay-people.”

¹ Tradition, *i.e.*, a statement handed down, from the Latin word *trado*, to hand down.

The council decreed that if any one shall say that "the mass ought to be celebrated only in the vulgar tongue, let him be accursed." Our twenty-fourth article says, "It is a thing plainly repugnant to the word of God, and the custom of the primitive Church, to have public prayer in the church, or to minister the sacraments in a tongue not understood of the people."

The council decreed that if any one shall say that "in the mass there is not offered to God a true and proper sacrifice . . . or that Christ did not ordain that his apostles and other priests should offer his body and blood . . . or that it is profitable only to the receiver, and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, and other necessities, let him be accursed." Our thirty-first article says, "The offering of Christ once made is that perfect . . . satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world . . . and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits."

The Romish tenets respecting private confession, penances, purgatory, indulgences, invocations and prayers to saints, honour due to relics, and due veneration to the images of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the saints, were enforced. The celibacy of the clergy and the infallibility and dominion of the Church of Rome were strongly decreed. It will thus be seen that the council of Trent fully and finally adopted all the errors which had been engrafted on the faith of the catholic Church.

Within a few weeks after the conclusion of this council pope Pius IV. confirmed its proceedings, and a little later put forth a short summary of its doctrinal decisions in the form of a profession of faith, which is usually known by the name of pope Pius's creed. This was immediately received throughout the Romish Church, and has been in succeeding times acknowledged by her members; and aliens (or converts), on admittance to her communion, make public avowal and attestation of their assent to it, first reciting the Nicene creed, and afterwards this creed of pope Pius as an appendix to it. One of the sentences in the latter runs as follows: "I also undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly by the most holy council of Trent."¹

The space and design of this little work only admits of the above sketch of the doctrines set forth by the Roman, and controverted by the Anglican, Church. It will suffice to show how essential are the differences between them, and how many additions have been made by Rome to the "faith once delivered to the saints."

The articles of religion of our Church were drawn up by Cranmer and Ridley, assisted by other divines, and they are to this day

¹ *The Churches of Rome and England Compared*, by Richard Mant, D.D., bishop of Down and Connor, published by S.P.C.K.

essentially acknowledged as the laws of doctrine in the English Church. Our liturgy and articles are witnesses to the spirit in which our Reformation was conducted; and though our thanks are first due to that sustaining Providence which enabled Cranmer to struggle successfully with difficulties such as we can scarcely now imagine, we must not forget the gratitude and reverence we owe to the archbishop for his patience, moderation, and diligence.¹ In speaking of the continuity of the English Church we state an historical fact. Measures had been adopted to end the papal authority in England before points of doctrine were touched. The work done by the civil and ecclesiastical authorities was not the displacing of the old Church and supplanting it by some new sect, but it was the gradual reformation of that old catholic Church which had been established in these islands. The supremacy of the crown was no new pretension; it had been enforced or suffered to sleep according to the power of the monarch who occupied the throne, but it was continually re-asserted and re-enacted. The distinction between the royal and sacerdotal powers was disregarded by Cromwell in the reign of Henry VIII., and by the unprincipled men who formed the government of Edward VI., and Cranmer often permitted the royal supremacy to encroach on the authority of the Church; but England had at all times protested against the usurped powers of the pope, and a steady determination to maintain the liberties of the Church and realm of England against popish aggression gained ground.²

This appears a suitable place to allude to the origin of the term 'protestant.' A diet (or assembly of the representatives of the German states) was held at Spire in 1526, and ended more favourably towards Luther and the friends of the Reformation than was expected, as it was decided that instead of using violent means to suppress these religious differences, the princes and states of the German empire should be allowed to manage matters in the manner they thought most expedient; at the same time the emperor was requested to assemble a free and general council. But this tranquility did not last long. A new diet assembled at Spire in 1529, when the emperor Charles V., having got rid of various political troubles, found leisure to direct Church affairs. The power which had been granted to each prince with regard to the management of religious differences was now revoked, and every change that should be introduced into doctrine, discipline, or worship was declared unlawful until the determination of the approaching council was known. This decision was considered unjust and intolerable by the elector of Saxony and other members of the diet who were persuaded of the necessity of the Reformation, and who felt certain that a lawful council free from the despotic influence of Rome would never be granted by the pope in such a critical time. Their convictions were borne out by the results of the council of Trent,

¹ Massingberd, p. 359.

² Dean Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops*.

which we have just related. When these princes found all their arguments of no avail they entered a solemn protest against this decree on the 19th of April, 1529, and hence arose the word 'protestant,' which has since been universally applied by the Romish Church to those who renounce her superstitions,¹ while she claims the term catholic (or universal) as exclusively her own. The term protestant was at first applied to the Lutherans only, and its more general application is of a comparatively modern date.

We, as members of the Anglican communion, may call ourselves protestants, as protesting in our articles and liturgy against the errors of Rome; but the term was of foreign origin and never formally adopted by us, and we must never lose sight of our still higher claim to be catholics as members of a branch of the holy catholic and apostolic Church, in which we declare our belief whenever we repeat our creed. In the early times of Christianity the term catholic applied to those who held the true faith as universally received by the Church; but Rome asserts that those churches only who acknowledge the pope's supremacy have a right to the title. For this reason we call them Roman catholics or Romanists, and churchmen would do well to bear this distinction in mind.

The subject of a further revision of the Book of Common Prayer was brought forward by Cranmer, as objections were raised by Bucer, Peter Martyr, and others to some portions of it, as well as to some of the rubrics. It has been already stated that Bucer was too apt to object to primitive usages because they had been misapplied by the Church of Rome. Peter Martyr's feeling was stronger on this point. The review of the Common Prayer was brought before convocation, when some alterations and additions were made, and early in 1552, having also received the sanction of the two houses of parliament, it was directed to be used throughout the kingdom, on All Saints' Day of that year.² This is called the second prayer book of king Edward VI.'s reign.

The articles of religion received the authority of convocation and were published with the royal license in 1553. This was the last public work of Cranmer in the English Reformation. When we consider the unscrupulous character and Erastian views of many of those who were high in place and power, and the conflicting elements at work, it becomes a matter of admiration and surprise that so fair a fabric should have arisen out of such disorder. That our reformers should have sought out successfully the old ways which had been so overgrown and hidden, that they should have given us a Church alike removed from ostentation and meanness—for this we owe them lasting gratitude. Their moderation and discretion induced them to retain the good and reject the evil; they adopted the middle path, and did not rashly abolish, nor blindly adopt, ancient customs and ancient forms. In these days we can

¹ Mosheim, vol. iii., p. 53.

² Collier, vol. v., pp. 397, 433; also Archdeacon Berens's *History of the Prayer Book*; to both of which works the reader is referred for further particulars of this transaction.

scarcely remove ourselves even in imagination to the age and scenes in which Cranmer and Ridley moved, or fully value the wisdom which, under God's blessing, conducted them through their labours. On the one hand was the recollection of their youth, and the gorgeous ceremonies to which they had been accustomed; on the other, the contempt for all decency of ritual¹ which was displayed by those who, in repudiating the errors of the Romish Church, had become unmindful of the apostle's admonition, "Let all things be done decently and in order," 1 Cor. xiv. 40. This middle way has been beautifully described by one of our old poets and divines—the saintly Herbert.

THE BRITISH CHURCH.

"I joy, dear mother, when I view
Thy perfect lineaments, and hue
Both sweet and bright.

Beauty in thee takes up her place;
And dates her letter from thy face
When she doth write.

She, on the hills, which wantonly
Allureth all, in hope to be
By her preferred.

Hath kissed so long her painted shrines,
That even her face by kissing shines,
For her reward.

She, in the valley, is so shy
Of dressing, that her hair doth lie
About her ears.

While she avoids her neighbour's pride,
She wholly goes on th' other side,
And nothing wears.

But dearest mother (what those miss)
The mean²—thy praise and glory is;
And long may be!

Blessed be God, whose love it was
To double-moat thee with his grace;
And none but thee."

The king's health began to fail and symptoms of pulmonary consumption had appeared. On one occasion bishop Ridley, when preaching before him, dwelt on the pitiable state of the poor, and the duty of those in authority to provide means for their relief. The young king, applying the remark to himself as being in chief authority, asked the bishop's advice as to the best manner of doing so, and desired that no time should be lost. The result was the founding of Christ's hospital for the education of children of poor parents; St. Thomas's and St. Bartholomew's for the relief of the sick, and Bridewell for the correction of the vagabond and evil-disposed

¹ Blunt, p. 230.

² Or middle course.

persons. He endowed these hospitals, inserting the sum with his own hand when he signed the deed, at a time when he had scarcely strength to guide the pen, saying, "Lord God, I yield thee most hearty thanks that thou hast given me life thus long to finish this work to the glory of thy name."¹ That life was fast passing away. A few hours before his death he poured forth his heart in prayer: "Lord God, deliver me out of this life and receive me amongst thy chosen; howbeit, not my will, but thine be done. . . . Oh Lord, bless this people, and save thine inheritance. O Lord, save thy chosen people of England . . . defend this kingdom from papistry, and maintain thy true religion; that I and my people may praise thy Holy Name for Jesus Christ's sake." Then, as he sank in the arms of Sir Henry Sidney, he exclaimed, "I am faint; Lord, have mercy upon me, and receive my spirit"—and instantly expired, when within three months of completing his sixteenth year, after a reign of six years and six months, A.D. 1553.

Edward VI. was as remarkable for his attainments as for his piety; he spoke and wrote Latin and French with ease and fluency, and was acquainted with Greek, Spanish, and Italian. His diary, written in his own hand and carried on to November, 1552, shows how well he was formed for government. In it most of the remarkable events which happened during his reign are set down; all occurrences relating to peace or war, to business of Church or state, are entered as they happened, and show a wit and judgment far beyond his years.

Notwithstanding his good qualities, the kingdom was far from being prosperous. Avarice and sacrilege, ambition and faction amongst the nobility, and insurrection amongst the peasantry everywhere prevailed. In some cases the people were excited by the religious reforms which were effected; in others by their poverty and servile condition. In Norfolk the peasants were headed by a rich tanner of Wymondham. They complained "that the free-born commonalty were oppressed and trampled upon by a small number of the nobility and gentry; that they were harassed with perpetual drudging to support the pomp and luxury of these men; that they dragged a wretched life, and were treated little better than beasts of burden." Then came a complaint that holy ceremonies were abolished, and a new form of religion forced upon them, by complying with which the hardships of this life would be followed by the punishment of the next. In the west of England similar disturbances occurred.² We have before mentioned that the peasants had been serfs upon the land, and as civilization increased, so did their wants. They now desired the freedom to think and to act for themselves, which the old state of society had prevented their attempting.

A writer of that day made the following remarks on the misappropriation of the revenues of the religious houses which had been granted to the laity. He said that every good man must wish that

¹ Southey, p. 316.

² Collier, vol. v., pp. 511, 581.

after the dissolution of monasteries, the lands, tithes, and churches (though abused by those who had held them) should have been bestowed for the advancement of the Church so as in some way to carry out the wishes of those who had founded them, instead of being given to those who stood ready to devour what was sanctified to God's use. He adds that the abuse "through laymen possessing appropriated churches and tithes deserved to be seriously thought on by every layman that now enjoys any of them, especially where the divine service is not carefully provided for. . . . The pretence was to amend that which was amiss, but it is amended as the proverb says the devil amended the dame's leg; when he should have set it right he brake it in pieces." And so (says Sir William Dugdale) the author goes on with sharp reproofs to the laymen that fed themselves with the tithes, while the souls of the parishioners suffered famine for want of fit maintenance for a pastor.¹

The death of Edward VI. was a great blow to our reformers, as the princess Mary, who was the rightful heir to the throne, being the daughter of Henry VIII. by Katherine of Arragon, was a strict papist. Edward, being fully aware of the danger to the reformed faith which her succession would cause, had left the crown to his cousin the lady Jane Grey. She was married to lord Guildford Dudley, a son of the duke of Northumberland, whose ambition caused him to use his influence to induce Edward to come to this decision. This gifted and excellent lady was most unwilling to accept the crown, to which she considered she had no just right, but she yielded to the entreaties of her father and father-in-law. When Mary heard of this attempt to deprive her of the succession, she at once assumed the royal authority and called some of the nobles to her aid. The nation generally considered her claim just, and she was soon proclaimed queen, in London. The duke of Northumberland was beheaded, and lady Jane Grey and her husband were imprisoned in the tower. Some uneasiness on the subject of religion was felt in the public mind; and though the queen assured the lord mayor of London "she did not mean to strain any man's conscience," this promise was withdrawn within a very short space. Bishops Gardiner and Bonner, the leaders of the Romanist party, were now released from the tower, and were reinstated in their bishoprics. Gardiner became also lord chancellor. Many Englishmen, seeing the approaching storm, left the country for safety, as also did those foreign reformers who had found an asylum in England. Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and Hooper were convinced that the cause of religion would be injured by their flight, and they had borne too prominent a part in the Reformation to be justified in quitting their posts.

Mary married in 1554 Philip II., king of Spain, which union was most unpopular with her subjects, who, amongst other objections to the match, feared their country would become a mere province of Spain. So discontented were the people that rebellion broke out.

¹ Collier, vol. v., p. 515.

Mary imprisoned her sister Elizabeth, whom she had never loved because she was the daughter of her mother's rival, Anne Boleyn, and because she was supposed to be favourable to the reformers. The rebellion was still more fatal to lady Jane and her husband; they were condemned to death, and as lady Jane was proceeding to the scaffold, she met her husband's headless body. It had been intended to execute them at the same time; but Mary and her advisers feared the effect which the youth, beauty, and innocence of the victims might have upon the multitude. Lady Jane was only eighteen, and her husband but little older.

A papal legate was again received in London in the person of cardinal Pole, an Englishman, who was related to the royal family, and who had been banished the country in the reign of Henry VIII., and popery was restored as far as the power of the queen could do so.

Mary was a sincere but narrow-minded bigot; she clung to the tenets of the Church of Rome, in which only she believed salvation could be found, and she hated the Reformation to which she attributed her own and her mother's wrongs. She looked upon the spoliation of the Church, which had taken place in the two last reigns, as the work of the ecclesiastical reformers. We have stated that such was not the case, they being strongly opposed to it; but it had been carried on by the laymen who were in power, actuated by tyranny and avarice. Mary wished to restore to the Church those lands which had formerly belonged to the monasteries, and which had passed through the crown into other hands, but she found this was beyond her power. She, however, set a worthy example to those who had been enriched by church property; for the tenths and first fruits of benefices, which had been attached to the crown by parliament, in the reign of Henry VIII., were restored by her.

The terrible persecution, which disgraced the three last years of this queen's reign, now commenced in all its fury. Bishops Gardiner and Bonner were the principal actors; the former as the adviser, the latter as the active agent of persecution. Of the bishops who adhered to the Reformation, only two remained at liberty, some having gone abroad, and others being imprisoned. Several members of convocation opposed the condemnation of the Book of Common Prayer, and the revival of the doctrine of transubstantiation. It is sad to think that the sacrament of Christ's passion, the solemn remembrance and communion of his blessed death, should have been used as a means of destruction, a snare to the weak-hearted, and a condemnation to the resolute. What more can be required of a Christian than is expressed in one of archbishop Cranmer's answers to his examiners at Oxford? "Christ's body is truly present to them that truly receive him." What more than Latimer's assertion? "to the faithful believer there is given the real or spiritual body of Christ. . . . Let no scorner suppose that I make nothing of the sacrament but a bare or naked sign."

There was still a party in parliament who objected to submit to

the see of Rome; but they were in a minority, and cardinal Pole pronounced a solemn absolution of the realm. The persecuting laws were revived, and the statute of Henry IV. was restored to the statute book. Cardinal Pole was a patron of learning, and he tried to induce the nobles and others to restore some of their plunder to the Church. His natural temper was mild, and at the council of Trent he always advocated gentle measures; but his better nature was overcome by his devotion to false principles, and he remains a proof that moral worth and a highly cultivated mind could not save a man from encouraging persecution when he had persuaded himself that to disown the pope was to renounce Christianity.¹

The queen's husband was the son of the emperor Charles V., whose last instructions to him were, "I pray and command my son to see that the heretics . . . be pursued with all the severity which their crime merits. I bind him, above all, to protect the holy office of the Inquisition." With such religious views Philip came to England, and he and those whom he brought with him, heightened the queen's natural bigotry by their own cruel intolerance. Carranza, who was afterwards promoted by Philip to be archbishop of Toledo, acted as the queen's confessor, and it was under the direction of the Dominican friars, who accompanied him to England, that the body of Peter Martyr's wife, who had died about four years before, was disinterred in Christ-church cathedral, Oxford, and thrown upon a dunghill, and the body of Bucer was taken up and burned at Cambridge.²

One would wish to avoid relating the scenes which passed; but the finger of God directed the result, for this persecution taught the English nation how to value the men who had been engaged in the work of reformation. A cause for which nearly three hundred persons gave their bodies to be burned, and thirty thousand endured exile and loss of goods, showed in the eyes of Europe a moral strength, foretelling that as these shores had borne the fire of persecution they should in years to come be the abode of a pure faith, and the refuge and asylum of other sufferers.³

The first person who wore the martyr's crown was John Rogers, prebend of St. Paul's, who had formerly helped Tyndal and Coverdale in the translation of the Bible. He might have escaped out of the country, but he considered it his duty to stand like a true soldier of the cross and abide the worst. Rogers, like many others, was at first imprisoned, and from prison he was taken to the stake. His wife, accompanied by their children, met him on his way to execution; but the sight of them did not shake his faith or courage, and he met death with such calmness and patience that many present derived encouragement from his example.⁴

John Hooper, bishop of Gloucester, when urged to save himself

¹ Massingberd, p. 384—386, and p. 390—393.

² Massingberd, p. 396—398.

³ Massingberd, p. 386.

⁴ Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, vol. iii., p. 98—108.

by flight, declined to do so, being determined not to forsake his flock. Both he and Ridley were imprisoned. When they were suffering from persecution, Ridley, who had disputed with Hooper on the subject of the vestments, wrote to his brother in affliction, and, alluding to that discussion, said that though they might have "jarred," let them now join hands and be true to the end. The place chosen for Hooper's martyrdom was in front of the cathedral at Gloucester, where he had so often preached. It being market day, a large crowd of people had assembled, many of whom mourned bitterly for him, but he was not permitted to address them. When tied to the stake he prayed that he might have faith and patience to endure to the end; this was granted to him, though his sufferings were great and protracted.¹

Doctor Rowland Taylor, rector of Hadley in Suffolk, suffered death on the same day as bishop Hooper. He had been imprisoned in London for two years. The execution was appointed to take place in Hadley. His wife and daughter met him at Aldgate, and as he took leave of them he said, "Be of good comfort, dear wife, for I am quiet in my conscience." The next day, as he was proceeding under the charge of the sheriff of Essex, his old servant, John Hull, met him with his son. He prayed for his boy, and, returning him to the servant, took the latter by the hand, saying, "Farewell, John Hull, the faithfulest servant that ever man had!" As they approached Hadley, the sheriff asked him how he fared, "Never better," he answered; "I am almost at home. . . . I am even at my Father's house." The streets through which he passed were lined with people who cried out, "There goeth our good shepherd who so fatherly hath cared for us; good Lord, strengthen and comfort him!" Taylor had been provided with money by some charitable persons when in prison, and that which remained he carried with him in a glove. When he passed the almshouses at Hadley he distributed it; and on reaching the last house, he asked if the blind man and woman were yet living there, and being told that they were, he threw the glove with the remainder of the money into the window. On reaching the place of martyrdom, he exclaimed, "God be thanked, I am at home." The people burst into loud weeping when they saw the venerable man with his white hair thus awaiting his doom, and cried out, "God save thee, good doctor Taylor; Jesus Christ strengthen and help thee; the Holy Ghost comfort thee." He was not allowed to address the assembled throng; but he told them he had taught them nothing but that which was in God's holy book, and that he had come hither to seal it with his blood, and thus he rendered up his soul to his heavenly Father.²

Ferrar, bishop of St. David's, was another of the noble army of martyrs who suffered in this reign. He had been chaplain to archbishop Cranmer, and was one of those whom Henry VIII. sent

¹ Foxe, vol. iii., pp. 121, 127.

² Foxe, vol. iii., p. 144.

to his nephew, James V. of Scotland, to persuade him to disown the pope's supremacy. Ferrar was sent to his own diocese to suffer, and was burned at Carmarthen. When a Welsh friend came to see him and lamented the death he was to die, his resolute answer was, "If you see me stir in the fire, believe not the doctrine I have taught." The system of sending the more noted of the reformers to be executed in their own locality was adopted with a view to strike terror into the hearts of the inhabitants, and thus induce those who held the reformed opinions to forsake them; but the effect was such as the sufferers hoped it would be—not such as the persecutors expected. It seemed as if the martyrs, like Elijah the prophet, bequeathed a double portion of their spirit to their friends and followers.¹

The three chief pillars of the Reformation now fell victims to the raging storm. Bishops Ridley and Latimer suffered first, and archbishop Cranmer a little later. The latter was an especial object of dislike to the queen in consequence of the part he took in the matter of Henry's divorce. He had been accused of treason and declared guilty of having signed the late king's will, which altered the succession of the crown. Cranmer had excused himself, and obtained pardon, but the reason for this lenity appears to have been that he could afterwards be proceeded against as a heretic. Nicholas Ridley was of an old family in Northumberland, a man of learning and of a kind and gentle nature. By Cranmer's influence he was made bishop of Rochester, and, on Bonner's deprivation, he succeeded him in the see of London. Foxe says, "He so occupied himself in teaching and preaching that a good child was never more loved by his parents than he by his flock and diocese." Hugh Latimer, bishop of Worcester, was one of the most powerful and popular preachers of his day. His plain speaking and honest zeal gained him a host of enemies; during the latter part of Henry's reign he was imprisoned, but was released on the accession of Edward VI., being then about 70 years of age. He was in the habit of preaching twice on Sundays, and sometimes preached before the young king. He was called by the people 'good old father Latimer.' In March, 1554, Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer had been brought from the tower to Oxford, where in St. Mary's church, the argument on transubstantiation was carried on for three successive days between each of them and their opponents. Bishop Ridley's readiness of reply displayed wonderful memory, presence of mind, and acquaintance with Scripture and the writings of the ancient fathers; but all was to little purpose before judges who were determined to convict. They were condemned to be burned; but the sentence was not carried into execution upon the two bishops until the 16th October, 1555, and in the archbishop's case it was deferred till six months later; and so these brave spirits, during their long imprisonment, had leisure to write those letters of counsel, encouragement, and comfort to

¹ Massingberd, p. 363. Collier, vol. vi., p. 107. Southey, p. 339.

the faithful brethren, which are said to have so greatly forwarded the cause of the Reformation. Above all, Ridley's letter, entitled his *Last farewell to all his true and faithful Friends in God*, has been considered one of the most pathetic pieces of writing which our language contains. After bidding farewell in touching words to his relations and friends, he says, "Farewell, Cambridge, my loving mother and tender nurse. . . . I pray God that his laws and the sincere gospel of Christ may ever be truly taught and faithfully learned in thee. Farewell, Pembroke hall, of late my own college, my care, and my charge. . . . Thou wast ever named since I knew thee, which is now thirty years ago, to be studious, learned, and a setter forth of Christ's gospel." Then he turns to London, his late diocese, and reminds those who listened to him in times past that they should listen much more now when he had no other expectation but shortly to stand before the seat of his eternal Judge.¹ The place of execution was on the north side of Oxford, opposite Balliol college. When the day arrived, Ridley came forth, and, as he passed the place where Cranmer was confined, looked up, but did not see him. It is said, however, that the archbishop beheld all from the roof of his prison, and on his knees begged God to support his companions in their agony and prepare him for his own. Ridley, hearing a noise behind him, turned, and his eyes rested on the venerable form of Latimer. "Oh, be you there?" said Ridley. "Yea," said the aged martyr; "I am after you as fast as I can follow." Ridley embraced his companion, and said, "Be of good heart, brother; for God will either assuage the fury of the flames, or else strengthen us to abide it." Then they kneeled down and prayed earnestly. When they were fastened to the stake, a lighted faggot was laid at Ridley's feet, when Latimer exclaimed in prophetic words that have never been, and never will be forgotten, "Be of good comfort, Master Ridley, and play the man; we shall this day light such a candle by God's grace in England as I trust shall never be put out."²

We must now turn for a moment to the death of a very different person—Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester. He was the queen's chief minister, and, as a statesman, did his duty to his country; but his name is more familiar to us as the great persecutor of the reformers. He was well versed in the religious questions of the times, and had not the plea of ignorance to excuse him. In little more than a month after the martyrdom of bishops Latimer and Ridley, Gardiner was taken ill and died; his bodily sufferings were great, and so were his terrors of conscience. When dwelling sorrowfully on the sinful character of his past life, he was reminded by those around him that St. Peter had fallen. "Alas!" said the unhappy bishop, "I have, indeed, erred like Peter, but I have not, like him, gone out and wept bitterly."³

¹ Blunt, p. 282. Foxe, vol. iii., p. 431.

² Foxe, vol. iii., p. 429.

³ Soames's *History of the Reformation*, vol. iv., p. 479.

The death of Gardiner made no change; the persecution was carried on by Bonner with even increased rigour, and the following year brought archbishop Cranmer to the stake. The delay in his execution had been arranged with sagacity by his enemies. Ridley and Latimer were possessed of greater courage and would have imparted their own constancy to him, had they all suffered together, but they were taken, and he was left. It is true that a different form was required for his dispatch, he being an archbishop; but they had been prisoners for so long a period that there was ample time to have had this arranged. He was now again brought before the commissioners and maintained his cause with his usual learning and gentleness. He was degraded from his sacred office, but was removed to the house of the dean of Christchurch, where he was treated with indulgence and marks of regard, rather as a guest than a prisoner. His enemies knew his natural timidity, and practised on it. He was told that the king and queen desired his conversion above all things; that he might yet live many years, and that death, especially such a death, was grievous. Cranmer, who had withstood the judgment hall and prison, was not proof against this craft, and they at length succeeded in inducing him to sign a recantation, or a document which has been called such, under a promise that his life should be spared. This incident causes a terrible sadness to all true-hearted men; and, to quote Fuller when alluding to another subject, "to conceal the fault, had been partiality; to excuse it, flattery; to defend it, impiety; to insult over him, cruelty; to pity him, charity; to be wary of ourselves in any like occasion, Christian discretion." But it has been well said by bishop Wilberforce, that "mingled with our sad sympathy for Cranmer, we feel deep indignation for those who, never having felt the bitterness of such a storm, the mingled softness and severity which tried every weak fibre of his heart, and who, in a less tempest, would perhaps make a greater shipwreck, can feel pleasure in defaming the fallen man."¹

But Cranmer's enemies never intended to release him; their only object was to endeavour to lower his character and lessen the influence of his opinions with his countrymen. The day for his execution was fixed, but it appears that even on the morning he was to suffer he was not informed of it, though many circumstances led him to think his end was intended, and he prepared accordingly. In the morning of the 21st March, 1556, Cranmer was taken to St. Mary's church to hear the sermon which, on account of heavy rain, was preached there instead of at the place of execution. He was placed on a high stage in front of the pulpit; the church was crowded by Romanists, who hoped to hear him confess his conversion to their doctrines, and by those who were reformers at heart, in the belief that he would not in the last act of his life forsake the truths which he had proclaimed. The sermon ended, he was called

¹ Blunt, p. 294. Foxe, vol. iii., p. 558. Bishop Wilberforce's *Essays on the Archbishops*.

upon to make "the true and undoubted profession of his faith." "I will do it," said Cranmer, "and that with a good will." He first exhorted his hearers to obedience, brotherly love, and charity, then repeated the apostles' creed, and declared his belief in every article of the catholic faith, in every word taught by our Saviour, his apostles, and prophets; "and now," he continued, "I come to the great thing which troubleth my conscience more than anything I ever said or did in my whole life;" and he remarked that this fault was setting abroad a writing contrary to the truth, which had been written for fear of death and to save his life, and which he now renounced: he then added, "Forasmuch as my hand offended contrary to my heart, my hand shall first be punished; for, when I come to the fire, it shall be first burnt." The Romanists appear to have been at first too much astonished to interrupt him, but he was speedily hurried out and conveyed to the stake—at the spot where Latimer and Ridley suffered. All fear had left him, and his venerable countenance moved the interest and compassion of the beholders. True to his purpose, as soon as the flames arose, he stretched forth his hand and held it so that the people might see it burning, before the fire reached any other part of his body, often repeating, "This unworthy hand!" No cry was heard from him save that of the martyr Stephen, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!" He stood immovable at the stake to which he was bound, his countenance was raised, looking to heaven, and thus he yielded up his spirit. His heart was found unconsumed amid the ashes.¹ Cardinal Pole succeeded Cranmer as archbishop of Canterbury.

The persecution produced exactly the contrary effect to that which the papal party intended. As the havoc which had been committed under the name of the Reformation, and the distress caused by the suppression of the monasteries, had led the people to rejoice in the re-establishment of Romanism, so popery became by these cruelties an object of horror and hatred to the nation. Those whom books and sermons would not have reached, were converted to the reformed faith by the firmness with which the martyrs suffered. They felt that it could be no light principle for which so many laid down their lives. Numbers of persons in humble life, artificers and workmen, fell victims to the flames, not from proclaiming their opinions as the clergy and more learned reformers did, but from their not declaring their belief in Romish doctrines. The same spirit which encouraged the Inquisition in Spain and introduced it into the Netherlands would have attempted its introduction here, but the feelings of the country were opposed to such an atrocious system. The persecution lasted four years, and the number of those who perished in prison is unknown. There was a general feeling of insecurity, and the spirit of the nation sank, but God mercifully cut short this tyranny. Death put an end to Mary's cruelties on the 17th of November, 1558, after a reign of five years and four months. She left none to lament her, and there was not even an ap-

¹ Foxe, vol. iii., p. 563. Southey, p. 370.

pearance of sorrow for her loss. Fuller thus speaks of her: "Melancholic in mind, unhealthful in body; little feared of her foreign foes, less beloved by her native subjects; not over-dear to her own husband; unsuccessful in her treaties for peace; and unfortunate in her undertakings for war." Mary died in the morning, and that night bonfires were made to celebrate the accession of her sister Elizabeth.¹

¹ Southey, p. 376.

CHAPTER XXIII.

CENTURY XVI.

REFORMATION COMMENCED IN SCOTLAND. STATE OF IRELAND.

THE state of the Church in Scotland now claims our notice, and we must return to the time of Henry VIII., in order to trace the progress of the Reformation in that kingdom. In England the work had been begun and carried on by the heads of the Church and state: in Scotland it was opposed by both. When Henry VIII. fell out with the pope, the Scottish clergy became alarmed, and resolved to protect their interests with vigour; and we have stated that when Henry wished to meet his nephew, James V., at York, upon business of state, the bishops and higher ecclesiastics succeeded in preventing the meeting. They feared Henry's influence as regarded the doctrine and discipline of their Church.

The avarice and immorality of which the great body of the Scotch clergy were accused, caused the loss of their influence with the laity, and, as they had by various means gained possession of more than half the landed property of the country, or of its annual produce, it is not surprising that all orders of the people were ready to listen to those who exposed the selfishness and luxury of their spiritual guides. The power of the country was divided between the nobles and the ecclesiastics: the former were rude, ignorant, and proud; they set the law at defiance, and were more powerful than their sovereign. They called out their vassals, and settled every trifling dispute with the sword, just as the Welsh chieftains had done two centuries previously. King James V. bestowed the principal offices of state upon ecclesiastics, hoping by this means to break the power of the nobility. This caused much jealousy on the part of the warlike barons, whose dislike of the clergy was increased by the contempt which they felt for book-learning; for they regarded such knowledge as unworthy of their rank, and of those manly exercises which they considered as alone befitting it. They wished to throw off the religious yoke which had long been oppressive, and which they were now ready to consider unchristian; for the reformed opinions had made their way into the country, as the measures pursued by the English reformers had a natural influence in the neighbouring kingdom.

The first martyr was a young man of noble birth, named Patrick Hamilton, who returned to Scotland from the continent of Europe where he had been studying the doctrines of Luther and other German divines. He spoke against the corruptions that prevailed and the necessity of a change in doctrine and discipline with so much energy and eloquence, that he made a deep impression on his hearers. His learning and courteous manners gained him many followers; but as he held a certain rank in the Church, being titular

abbot of Ferne, he was treated at first with some appearance of lenity. After he had settled at St. Andrew's, a Dominican friar, who came to him pretending to seek instruction in his opinions, afterwards denounced him as a heretic, and caused him to be brought before the archbishops of Glasgow and St. Andrew's. When called on for his defence he stated that most of his opinions could be plainly proved by Scripture, and as to the rest that he had heard nothing to convince him they were mistaken. He was condemned to be burned without delay, and the execution (which took place in February, 1528) was hastened, lest the king, who was absent at the time, should use his authority to save him. The mild conduct of the sufferer made a deep impression on the feelings of the people, which was increased by the fate of his accuser, who is said to have been smitten by the conviction of having shed innocent blood, and to have died insane soon afterwards. When it was resolved to condemn another victim to the stake, it is related that one John Lindsay, who attended the archbishop, advised him to burn the heretic in some hollow cellar; for "the smoke," said he, "of Mr. Patrick Hamilton hath infected all those on whom it blew." This was indeed an eloquent argument against all persecution for religious faith; but it was many years before mankind profited by the reflection. The fierce spirit which was now shown caused several learned men to retire into England, where they received a welcome from Henry VIII., who was not unwilling to protect those who were out of favour in the Scottish territory. The pope meanwhile employed the usual expedients to secure the attachment of James. He sent him many gifts consecrated by his blessing, and consented that a considerable addition to the royal revenues should be drawn from the church funds. In 1539, the archbishop of St. Andrew's died, and was succeeded by his nephew, cardinal Beaton, who endeavoured to check with energy the progress of the reformed doctrines.

King James V. died in 1542, a few days after the birth of his daughter, Mary, who succeeded to the inheritance of an unruly kingdom. The prospect of a long minority roused the ambition and jealousy of the nobility and higher ecclesiastics. The dignity of regent was bestowed on the earl of Arran. The feudal system had continued longer in Scotland than in any other part of Europe, and the nobility, though few in number, were possessed of extensive territories, and enjoyed a degree of power which was unsuited to a monarchical government. The princes of the house of Stuart were aware of this disadvantage, and endeavoured to lessen the influence of the barons. The choice of ecclesiastics for the more dignified offices of state, though partly forced upon James V. by the ignorance of his warlike nobles, was none the less a cause of grievance to them. They envied the power and riches of the Church, and wished to regain the revenues which their ancestors had bestowed upon it.¹ At the period when the Scottish crown descended to the

¹ Russell's *History of the Church in Scotland*, vol. i., ch. iv.

infant Mary, the condition of the Scottish Church, says the writer from whom we quote, was peculiarly unhappy. The persecution was encouraged by the prelates and chief ecclesiastics. Those who suffered, maintained various opinions contrary to the universal Church, but there were several theologians who wished to restore a purer doctrine and discipline, without introducing novel views of their own. Little is known of the personal history of this portion of the clergy.¹ The persecuting spirit of the prelates, and the ignorance and avarice of the nobles, produced that melancholy spectacle of violence and destruction which distinguished the Scottish reformation.

Henry VIII. wished to unite the two crowns by a marriage between his son, Edward, and the youthful queen; and Arran made a treaty with him by which she was to be sent to the English court for education when she was ten years old. Henry urged the regent to abolish the usurped power of the pope; but the Scotch nobility were offended by his impetuous temper and the ungracious manner in which he proposed his terms; and Arran, who was weak and timid, publicly abjured the reformed doctrines, and threw himself into the hands of the Romish party, of whom cardinal Beaton was the head. War broke out between the two kingdoms, and the conduct of the English was wantonly destructive. The great abbeys of Melrose, Dryburgh, and Jedburgh suffered most severely from the inroads of the invader, and at Melrose the tombs of the house of Douglas were rudely defaced.²

In 1543 a motion was made in the Scotch parliament that all persons should be permitted to read the Scriptures in their native language, but the regent's change of opinions had clouded the prospects of the reformers. A legate sent by the pope arrived in Scotland, in order to prevent the union of Mary with the English prince, and to help the cardinal archbishop of St. Andrew's to root out heresy wherever it was found. Beaton's hands were strengthened also by the queen mother, and he continued to persecute the reformers. No event during these persecutions caused such a deep feeling in the mind of the people as the burning of George Wishart. Little is known of the early life of this reformer; he left his native country and resided for some time in England and on the continent, and about 1543 he was at Cambridge. In the autumn of that year the first attack was made on the monastic houses in Scotland. The work of destruction was begun at Dundee. Wishart returned to Scotland about 1544. His sermons had a great effect upon the people. Among those who listened to them was the celebrated John Knox, who bore a two-handed sword, which was usually carried before the preacher. In January, 1546, Wishart was taken prisoner and delivered to cardinal Beaton, who caused him to be conveyed to St. Andrew's. He was brought to trial and made an able defence, but admitted that he did not hold any distinction to

¹ *The Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, by George Grub, A.M., vol. ii., p. 11.

² Grub's *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, vol. ii., p. 22.

exist between the clergy and the laity. He was pronounced guilty of the various charges brought against him, condemned to death as a heretic, and burned at St. Andrew's in February of that year. Wishart suffered martyrdom with great firmness, and prayed that those who had caused his death might be forgiven. The cardinal was aware that plots had been formed against his life by some of Wishart's protectors, and many writers maintain that the reformer was aware of the conspiracy; this question like others of a similar kind in the history of the Scottish reformation is attended with difficulty. It seems, however, scarcely reasonable to suppose that the man who died with the words of forgiveness on his lips could have taken an active part in the designs of murderers.¹

The martyrdom of Wishart seems to have given a great impetus to the progress of his opinions, and the cardinal became an object of hatred to a large proportion of the people. His career was soon cut short, for he was assassinated in the castle of St. Andrew's in May, 1547, by Norman Leslie, son and heir of the earl of Rothes, who was attended by several of his followers, and who, after reproaching the archbishop with his persecuting spirit and immoral life, plunged their weapons in his body. This event was deplored by the lovers of order and the true friends of the Reformation; but such was the temper of the country at that time that the popular writers, and many of the community, applauded the murder as an act of expediency and justice. Those who had shed the blood of the cardinal kept possession of the castle of St. Andrew's,² and applied to Henry VIII. for assistance; but his death took place not long afterwards, and Leslie and his party at length surrendered themselves prisoners to the French troops who had come to the regent's assistance. Amongst the captives was John Knox, who asserted that his residence with them had been necessary to his safety, and whose avowed sympathy with the act of the assassins would prevent his feeling any scruple about joining their company. Leslie stipulated that the lives of all within the castle should be saved, and that they should be sent into France.³

On the death of cardinal Beaton, the Reformation in Scotland became somewhat altered in its motives and objects. The adversaries of Rome at first chiefly attacked the corruptions of the papacy and the higher clergy; they had not yet questioned the constitution of the Church as a body whose form and power descended from apostolic times. They had not expressed a desire to see the orders of its ministers disturbed or lessened. The foundation of episcopacy had as yet been in some respects rather strengthened than weakened by the doctrines of Luther; for whereas the pope had usurped all the powers of the bishops into his own hands, the maxim that the pope had no greater power than any

¹ *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, by George Grub, A.M., vol. ii., p. 22—28.

² The archbishops of St. Andrew's resided in the castle till the murder of cardinal Beaton. After its surrender by the cardinal's assassins, the castle was demolished by order of the privy council.

³ Grub, vol. ii., p. 32. Russell, vol. i., ch. iv.

other prelate was calculated to restore to the episcopate the influence of which he had deprived it. But, on the other hand, the practice which the popes had gradually adopted when a bishop's see became vacant, of issuing a bull to the neighbouring bishops to consecrate a successor, had caused the prelates to be considered as only papal deputies, and the fact of a certain order of men having derived spiritual power by succession from the time of Christ and the apostles, became lost sight of. The consequence was that many of the reformers—and this was especially the case in Scotland—imagined that after throwing off the papal power, the constitution of the Church could only be continued by the authority of the king, or by the election of the people. In the early course of the Reformation, the principal reformers were eager and ready to commit to the sovereign the power of which they had determined to deprive the pope. They argued on the ground that all authority proceeds from the civil magistrate, and that the Church, though founded by Christ, had not the right of judging even in spiritual things. We shall see in the course of this history how completely these Erastian notions were afterwards given up by the Scotch, and how they resolved to bestow on the preachers of the gospel all the power and terrors which belonged to the former establishment. So true is it, as history continually shows us, that one extreme begets another.¹

Mary of Guise, the widow of James V., had become regent in place of the earl of Arran, who had resigned, and she was desirous that the infant queen, her daughter, should be sent into France for education, with the view to her union with the son of the French king, which event afterwards took place. The queen regent was a warm Romanist, and the death of Edward VI., with the accession of his sister Mary, seemed to threaten the progress of the reformed opinions in Scotland, as it did in England. But the persecution which drove many from the latter country supplied the former with zealous labourers in the cause, and they proved equal to the burden imposed upon them. The year 1555 was distinguished by the return of John Knox to his native country. On his arrival in Edinburgh, he preached boldly against the "idolatrie" of the "mass," and with such effect that he induced many persons of rank to give up their attendance at the service. The following year he was summoned to appear before the heads of the Roman party on a charge of heresy. He obeyed the summons, but he was accompanied by so many persons friendly to his views that the prosecution was given up, as it was feared that the court would be interrupted by noise or tumult. Encouraged by this unexpected triumph, Knox forthwith preached to a larger audience than he had yet addressed, and wrote a memorial to the queen-regent, urging certain changes in the doctrines and ceremonies of the Church, which, however, met with no attention. In 1557, Knox wrote from Geneva to his friends in Scotland, rebuking them for

¹ Russell's *History of the Church in Scotland*, vol. i., ch. iv.

want of zeal, and this admonition produced a great effect on the leaders of the party. A bond was therefore drawn up by the lords, who were afterwards called the lords of the congregation, the principal of whom was the earl of Argyle, in which they bound themselves to labour to obtain faithful ministers to preach the gospel and administer the sacraments, and they declared that they would defend them and every member of Christ's congregation with their lives, adding that they renounced "the congregation of Satan with all its abominations and idolatry," by which title they meant the Church of Rome. This bond became the model of the more formidable covenants of after years. They then directed that in all "parishes of the realm," the Book of Common Prayer of king Edward VI. be read every Sunday, and on other festival days in the churches, with the lessons of the Old and New Testaments; and that this should be done by the curates of the parishes if qualified; and that preaching and explanation of Scripture should be used privately till God should dispose the queen-regent to give further liberty. In issuing this order "to the whole realm," the lords of the congregation assumed the government of the country, and by describing themselves as the "congregation of God," and the Romanists as the "congregation of Satan," it became evident that all hope of unity or peace was at an end, and that the question would be determined by strength of hand, rather than by argument, or appeal to ancient authorities. The queen-regent was urged by her relatives in France, as much from political as religious motives, to restore the Romish worship, and other superstitions, contrary to the promises which she had given. She summoned the reformed clergy to appear before her at Stirling, but they were accompanied by so many persons that she promised not to proceed against the preachers, though she afterwards induced the judges to outlaw them.¹

Knox, who had been out of the country, re-appeared in May, 1559, and preached in his usual bold style at Perth. The people became greatly excited, and the sight of a priest preparing to say mass added fury to their zeal. They defaced the churches of the town, broke the images and sculptures, and tore down the altars. Several monasteries shared the same fate, being so entirely pillaged and destroyed that nothing remained of them but the bare walls. The news of these proceedings spread; nobles and people flew to arms, and rebellion and civil war broke out. Among the more violent reformers the destruction of the monasteries appears to have been deliberately planned. The queen-regent was indignant at these outrages, but the leaders of the disturbances addressed a letter to her which was written in a tone of defiance, and after a time they put forth a declaration addressed "to the generation of anti-Christ, the pestilent prelates and their shavelings within Scotland, the congregation of Christ Jesus within the same, sayeth," and the tenor of the document corresponded with the title. The abbey and

¹ Grub, vol. ii., p. 39—49. Russell, vol. i., ch. iv.

palace of Scone were attacked, and these magnificent buildings, the residence of the Scottish sovereigns, and the place of their coronation, were set on fire and reduced to a heap of ruins. A treaty was concluded in 1660 between the contending parties, but the lords of the congregation suspected the queen-regent's sincerity, and a fresh bond or engagement was signed by Argyle and lord James Stuart; the latter was an illegitimate son of king James V., and afterwards became regent and earl of Murray. The party appointed a meeting at St. Andrew's. Knox preached "resistance against the government" in defence of true religion, upon the text of our Saviour purging the temple. St. Mat. xxi. 12. His words had so strong an effect upon his audience that they renewed the work of destruction. At Perth, Stirling, Edinburgh, and St. Andrew's, the finest specimens of ecclesiastical architecture of which Scotland could boast were levelled with the dust, and the priests and the inmates of the religious houses were expelled. The country was wasted, but the clergy were the chief sufferers. The abbey of Melrose was again attacked, and the Scotch spoilers completed the destruction which the English invaders had commenced in that noble building. The queen-regent prepared to resist the insurgents, whose ravages showed that they wished not to reform but to destroy; but at this juncture Mary of Guise was released by death from the difficulties of her position. The lords of the congregation refused to allow her Christian burial in Scotland according to the rites of the Romish Church, and her body was carried to France and interred at Rheims.¹

The connivance of the leaders of the reforming party in Scotland with these outrages cannot be denied, but some apology for them may be allowed from the fact that the most important part of the Scotch Reformation was carried on by force of arms, and that the ruins of cathedrals and monasteries were looked on in much the same light as those of castles and strongholds in other wars. It was attributed to Knox as an honourable distinction that he struck not at the branches of the Romish Church but at its root; and as he and his followers did not wish for a reformation in the usual sense of that term, but a complete overthrow of the ancient system, retaining nothing that belonged to it in form or ritual, so they looked on the destruction of its stately buildings as no loss to true religion.²

We must now turn to Ireland, though we have nothing to relate that is very satisfactory regarding either the Church or state. The country had been under the nominal rule of the English kings since the reign of Henry II., at first under the title of lord of Ireland, and after the accession of Henry VIII. under that of king. The English sovereigns possessed the name, but little of the reality of dominion. The heads of the septs or clans only obeyed the English rule when it suited them, for they preferred the native or

¹ Grub, vol. ii., p. 68—78.

² Russell, ch. v. Collier, vol. vi., p. 286—290.

Brehon law, and followed the Irish customs. English laws were introduced, but they were observed only in that part of the country called the Pale, which had been subdued and colonized by the Anglo-Normans. In the rest of the country, the English kings had no courts of law to administer justice or exercise authority. If the English sovereign took an army there to quell disturbances, as Richard II. did, the Irish chiefs were ready to submit, but their obedience lasted only while the force which they feared was present. These chieftains degenerated rather than improved, they governed their followers in a very arbitrary and oppressive manner, and levied taxes to a great extent; the people were in a state of comparative slavery and had no security for the enjoyment of that which belonged to them. The Anglo-Norman lords, instead of imparting some of their more advanced civilization to the natives, fell into their habits and customs, and showed no more obedience to their sovereign than did the Irish chiefs. Their descendants considered that their forefathers had conquered the Irish lands without the aid of the sovereign, though with his permission, and they resolved to govern without his interference; but as they disagreed amongst themselves, they cultivated the friendship of the native chiefs, and sought to please them by assuming the names, learning the language, adopting the dress, and following the manners and customs of their adopted country. They thus hoped by their help to obtain an independence of the English crown.¹

We have stated that when Ireland was conquered by the English, in the reign of Henry II., the Church was brought under the supremacy of the pope. In early times Ireland had been called the island of saints; she had been the university of the west, but the invasions of the Danes and their cruel ravages had checked the progress of civilization and religion. It was not, however, till after the conquest of Ireland by Henry II. and his Norman barons that the papal power was established there. During the four succeeding centuries the extortions and exactions of the Roman legates, the bestowal of Irish bishoprics and dignities on Italians and other absentees, and the vast treasure drawn out of the country by Rome, formed some of the abuses of the papal system. It must also be said that the English settlement in Ireland produced many calamities in that country, through the ambition and tyranny of the English settlers during the four hundred years between the twelfth and sixteenth centuries. Ireland had received the true catholic faith and apostolic discipline in ancient times, untainted by error, and she was independent of Rome till the twelfth century.²

At the commencement of the reign of Henry VIII. the royal authority was scarcely more than nominal in Ireland; but the rule

¹ Carte's *Life of the Duke of Ormonde*, folio, vol. i., pp. 11, 13.

² *The Church of Ireland, her History and Claims*, by archdeacon (now bishop) Wordsworth, p. 44—48.

of Gerald Fitzgerald, the powerful earl of Kildare, as lord-deputy, was so oppressive that many of the Irish combined to lay their grievances before the king. The archbishop of Dublin headed the deputation.¹ Henry sent the earl of Surrey as lord-deputy, and he was succeeded by the earl of Ormonde. Quarrels and feuds continued to distract the country. This brings us to the period of the Reformation. The state of the Irish Church appears to have been most unsatisfactory, many of the bishops were non-resident, the clergy unlearned, the people untaught. The rival chieftains had but one bond of union, which was hatred of their English conquerors. In most countries anarchy is cured through the misery which it creates; but in Ireland, says a recent writer, "the free right of every one to make war upon his neighbour at pleasure, was the Magna Charta of liberty."² The Irish parliament, however, passed several statutes relating to the Church. The act of the king's supremacy was passed. Appeals to Rome were prohibited. The revenues of the religious houses, as well as the first-fruits of bishoprics, &c., were granted to the crown. The lesser abbeys were suppressed, as they had been in England, with a clause that the king and others who should hold them should enjoy them in the same manner as the abbots had done. The pope's authority was disowned under the penalty of *Præmunire*, and it was declared high treason to refuse the oath of supremacy. These and some other laws relating to the clergy were the principal points acted on. In the reign of Edward VI. the adoption of the first Prayer Book of that reign was discussed in the Irish convocation, and though opposed by the archbishop of Armagh and some other adherents of the papal party, the new ritual was approved by the archbishop of Dublin and other prelates, and used for the first time in the cathedral at Dublin, on Easter day, 1551. Unfortunately it was not translated into the Irish language, and its usefulness was thereby much impaired. Towards the end of Edward's reign the bishop of Ossory took an active part in the suppression of Romanism; but on the accession of queen Mary, 1553, he, with archbishop Browne of Dublin and other prelates, were deprived of their sees, which were irregularly filled by Romanizing bishops.³ The persecution in Mary's reign did not reach Ireland, and a curious incident is mentioned which caused this exemption. The queen had issued a commission to deal with the Reformation there as in England, and it was sent by doctor Cole, dean of St. Paul's, who was one of the commissioners. He stopped at Chester, where the mayor waited on him, and when conversing together the doctor brought out his little box, and opened it, saying, "Here is a commission to lash all the heretics of Ireland." The woman of the house had a friendly feeling for these heretics, having a brother in

¹ Dean Murray's *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, p. 188.

² *The English in Ireland*, by J. A. Froude, vol. i., p. 35.

³ *Key to Church History*, edited by Rev. J. H. Blunt, p. 48—50. Collier, vol. iv., p. 394. *The Church of Ireland*, by archdeacon (now bishop) Wordsworth, p. 48.

Ireland who was one of them ; she was, therefore, greatly troubled on hearing this remark, and waited for a convenient opportunity to possess herself of the document, which soon occurred. She opened the box, took out the commission, and put in its place a pack of cards with the knave of clubs uppermost. The dean returned to his room, suspecting nothing, and departed for Dublin. When he appeared before the lord-deputy, he stated the cause for which he had come, and presented the box. It was opened, that the contents of the commission might be read, when there appeared only the pack of cards with the knave uppermost. The dean, much amazed, assured the lord-deputy that he had had the document, but knew not where it was gone. To which the other replied, "Let us have another commission, and we will shuffle the cards meanwhile." Much troubled in mind, the dean returned to England, and obtained another document ; but whilst waiting on the coast for wind and weather, queen Mary died, and thus were the heretics of Ireland preserved.¹

¹ *Life and Death of George Browne, Archbishop of Dublin*, by Sir James Ware, p. 16.

CHAPTER XXIV.

CENTURY XVI.

ELIZABETH, A.D. 1558. PROGRESS OF THE REFORMATION. THE
PURITANS. STATE OF RELIGION IN SCOTLAND.

ELIZABETH ascended the throne of England at the age of twenty-five, amidst the rejoicings of the people. During Mary's reign she had lived at Hatfield house, in Hertfordshire, nominally free, but really a prisoner. Persecution ceased immediately on her accession. The queen commenced her reign with great prudence, and was wise and fortunate in the selection of her ministers. Her prospects were of a varied aspect; the late government had become hateful to the nation on account of its cruelties, and the ill success of its wars; for Calais, which was our last possession in France, had been lost to us. Elizabeth's conduct under circumstances of trial and oppression had made her popular, and no monarch had ascended the throne with a stronger feeling in her favour, or whose character stood higher amongst all orders of her subjects. This was the bright side; on the other hand, the exchequer was low, England was engaged in war with her nearest neighbours, France and Scotland; her army and navy were scarcely sufficient to defend her own shores; and it was probable that the queen's religious views would cause her to lose her only ally, Philip of Spain, her brother-in-law. Fortunately for England a strong enmity continued to exist between France and Spain. Henry III. of France claimed the English crown for his daughter-in-law, Mary queen of Scots, in right of her grandmother Margaret, the sister of Henry VIII., as Elizabeth was considered by all Romanists to be illegitimate. The French king desired his agents at Rome to gain the pope's interest, in which they succeeded. Pope Paul IV. refused to acknowledge Elizabeth as queen, or to show her any favour, not only because he considered her illegitimate, but because she had assumed the crown without his concurrence, which crown he claimed as being held in fee of the papal see. This haughty claim was the first step to that animosity between the courts of England and Rome, which existed throughout this reign.¹

The queen, therefore, stood in need of all that wisdom and prudence for which she proved so distinguished. She knew that her subjects were divided into two great parties. She wished to promote union at this time as far as she could do so, and her council was formed both from members of the reformed Church of England, and those who retained their attachment to the doctrines of the Church of Rome. Her principal secretary of state, Sir William Cecil, one of the greatest men of the age, was a member of the reformed

¹ Bishop Short, ch. viii., p. 226.

Church, and the especial confidence reposed in him by Elizabeth showed her intention to repair the fortunes of the Reformation. Sir Ambrose Jermyn, a Suffolk magistrate, stopped the persecution which was going on in his neighbourhood, for which a letter of approbation was sent to him from the queen; and she caused orders to be sent to the different prisons which required all those who had been confined for their religious opinions to be set at liberty.¹

At the very commencement of the reign there was held a deep but secret deliberation amongst those of high standing at court, as to the best means of restoring the Church to the position she held before Mary had become queen. Both Romanists and reformers became excited, and began to speak their minds freely in the pulpits; and while the one party considered the queen too slow in undoing the mischief wrought by Mary, the other did not spare hard words or abuse. Elizabeth and her confidential advisers regarded these proceedings with uneasiness, and a proclamation was issued prohibiting all preaching for the present by either party. The epistle and gospel, litany, ten commandments, creed, and Lord's prayer, were directed to be used in English; this had been already done in the royal chapel; no other alteration was yet made. A committee of divines was appointed to examine into the second prayer book of king Edward VI., but their consultations were marked by prudence rather than a zeal for alteration.²

The queen was crowned early in 1559, by Oglethorpe, bishop of Carlisle. None of the other bishops would consent to take part in the ceremony, for queen Mary had removed or executed all those who were favourable to the Reformation, and replaced them by zealous adherents of the Church of Rome. Therefore, when Elizabeth succeeded to the throne, these prelates looked upon her with unfavourable eyes. An English Bible was presented to Elizabeth during the procession.³ A new parliament was called which met soon after the coronation. With regard to the supremacy, the queen, though a strong assertor of her prerogative on all occasions, acted with great moderation. It will be remembered that by the act of supremacy of Henry VIII., he was styled supreme head of the Church of England under Christ. This gave no new power to the crown, but only asserted the old rights and its ancient jurisdiction over the state. Yet the manner in which Henry had assumed it gave offence, and the title was repudiated by the wisdom of Elizabeth, though she did not resign those powers with which even in spiritual affairs the constitution in Church and state had invested their sovereign.⁴ The oath of supremacy now taken, contained a declaration that the sovereign is the only supreme governor of this realm, as well in spiritual and ecclesiastical causes as temporal; and that no foreign prince, prelate, state, or potentate, hath or ought to have any jurisdiction,

¹ Strype's *Annals*, vol. i., pp. 25, 38.

² Bishop Short, p. 227. Strype, vol. i., pp. 41, 51—53.

³ Collier, vol. vi., p. 201.

⁴ Dean Hook, vol. iv., new series, p. 164.

superiority, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual within this realm. To guard against any wrong construction of this oath, the queen at the same time published injunctions wherein she declared that she pretended to no priestly power; and that "she challenged no authority but what was of ancient time due to the imperial crown of England . . . so as no other foreign power shall or ought to have any superiority," and she allowed every body to take the oath with this interpretation and meaning. It was decreed that if any persons by writing, teaching, or preaching, taught or defended such usurped power, as the oath condemned and had formerly been claimed in this country, such persons would for the first offence lose all their goods and chattels, or be imprisoned, and if ecclesiastics would lose their preferment. For the second offence they would come under the statute of *Præmunire*, passed in the reign of Richard II., and for the third they would be considered guilty of high treason. This oath was, of course, directed against the usurped authority of the pope.¹

The convocation of the Church met at the same time as the parliament. Bonner, bishop of London, was president, as cardinal Pole had died a few hours after queen Mary; and the see of Canterbury was vacant. Certain articles were presented by Bonner to the lord keeper Bacon in favour of transubstantiation. A conference between the divines of the reformed Church of England and those of Rome was agreed upon, which was held in Westminster abbey in the presence of the queen's council; many members of parliament being also present. The lord keeper acted as president, but not to over-rule any point in the controversy. Three questions were discussed—first, was it contrary to God's word and the customs of the primitive Church, to perform the services and administer the sacraments in an unknown tongue? 2. Has every Church the right to appoint rites and ceremonies, or to alter them, provided it be done to edification? 3. Can the mass be proved to be a propitiatory sacrifice for the dead, as well as the living? It was ruled that each party should give their reasons for or against in writing, and that after reading the same, the writing should be given to their adversaries to answer. Both parties agreed to this. The discussion began in due order but ended in confusion, which seems to have been caused by the Romanists refusing to comply with the conditions on which the conference was held, and evading the questions by maintaining that they ought not to be debated without leave from the pope. The bishops of Winchester and Lincoln showed more warmth than the rest, even threatening the queen with excommunication, and they were in consequence committed to the Tower and fined.²

The conference, however, was not without its use; it produced its effect on the minds of those who were present, and through them on the country at large, as it was considered that the Romanist

¹ Strype, vol. i., p. 68—70. Bishop Short, p. 228. Collier, vol. vi., p. 256.

² Collier, vol. vi., p. 205—216. Strype, vol. i., p. 87.

party could not stand the test of argument, and therefore preferred breaking up the conference to exposing the weakness of their opinions.¹

When the act of supremacy was passed, the queen and her council were empowered to erect the high commission court for ecclesiastical jurisdiction; but it was enacted that no person authorized to act therein should have power to adjudge any matter to be heresy, but such as had heretofore been held as such by authority of the Scriptures, or by the first four general councils, or such as shall hereafter be determined to be heresy by the high court of parliament with the assent of the clergy in their convocation.²

The four first general councils thus adhered to by the reformed Church of England are—

	A.D.
Nicca	325
Constantinople	381
Ephesus	431
Chalcedon	451 ³

The commissioners of this court had power to inquire into all offences which fell under the ecclesiastical laws; they could examine offenders upon oath, and punish them by fine or imprisonment. It is true that these powers were less than those in place of which they were substituted, and during Elizabeth's reign their practice was less objectionable than their principle, but they were afterwards grossly abused.⁴

An act of uniformity for divine worship was brought forward, and the advantage which the reformers had gained in the conference at Westminster became apparent, by the act obtaining a majority in both houses, though strong speeches were made against it by some of the Romanist prelates. A committee of divines was appointed to review the services, and second prayer book of king Edward VI., and upon their recommendation, the book was appointed by both houses of parliament to be used in all churches. The lords and commons did not appoint any committee to look into the services, which they properly considered was the business of the clergy. The prayer book was directed to come into use on the twenty-fourth of June, 1560, and this being St. John Baptist's day, caused the following rhyme to be made:—

“ Saint John Baptist's day
Hath put the pope away.”⁵

The oath of supremacy was now tendered to the bishops, who all, with the exception of the bishop of Llandaff, refused to take it, whereupon the queen sent for them. The bishops had greatly disoblged her, first by refusing to crown her, then by their conduct

¹ Bishop Short, p. 230.

² Collier, vol. vi., p. 225.

³ *Key to Church History*, edited by the Rev. J. H. Blunt.

⁴ Southey, p. 416.

⁵ Collier, vol. vi., p. 248. Strype, vol. i., p. 135.

at Westminster abbey, and now by refusing the oath of supremacy and scarcely owning her government. When they came, she reminded them of the oath they should have taken, recommended the affairs of the Church to their attention, and pressed them to follow the act of uniformity, and give up the superstitious worship of the Church of Rome. Upon this, Heath, archbishop of York, who had made a strong speech in the house of lords against the act of supremacy, replied, that he had been requested to remind her Majesty of her sister's zeal, and that the engagements of the latter to the holy see were binding to her successors. The queen replied, "that as Joshua declared, 'I and my house will serve the Lord,' so herself and her subjects were resolved to be governed by that resolution; that she had called her parliament and clergy together in imitation of Josiah to make a covenant with God and not with the bishop of Rome; that it was not in her sister's power to bind her successor to an usurped authority; that the crown being wholly independent she would own no sovereign but Christ Jesus, the king of kings; that the pope's usurpation over princes was intolerable, and she should look upon all her subjects, both clergy and laity, as enemies to God and the crown, who should henceforth assert his pretensions."

The bishops were then dismissed and deprived of their sees. At first they were imprisoned, but soon afterwards their confinement was made more easy, and they were either restored to their friends or to the custody of the bishops of the reformed Church. The bishops of Winchester and Lincoln, who had been most troublesome, and had threatened the queen with excommunication, had, however, no share in this favour. Fourteen bishops were deprived, besides other dignitaries and priests, but the deprivations were few in comparison with the number of clergy.¹ Bonner, bishop of London, lived for some years in the Marshalsea prison and fared better than he deserved, as he could take the air in the garden and orchard when he pleased, and was well kept and cared for. He even had permission to go beyond the bounds of the prison, but dared not do so, as he was so hated by the people, who had not forgotten his acts of cruelty, that he would have been in danger of losing his life.²

The bishops, who were deprived, made interest with the emperor of Germany to petition the queen to allow them to have churches in the cities and chief towns in the kingdom, but she replied, that though she would deal favourably with them, it was against her conscience and the safety of the kingdom to grant them churches, neither did she see why she should do so, as England had set up no new doctrine; nothing but what Christ commanded, and what was followed by the primitive and catholic Church, and approved of by the ancient fathers. Therefore, if she allowed them churches in

¹ Strype, vol. i., pp. 137, 138. Collier, vol. vi., p. 252,

² Ibid., vol. i., p. 144.

which to contradict the truths of the gospel, it would distract good people's minds and disturb true religion.

Parliament had restored to the crown the first-fruits, &c. It will be remembered that these were payments which had been claimed by and paid to the popes during the time of the papal encroachments, and Henry VIII., instead of giving them back to the Church at the commencement of the Reformation, appropriated them to the use of the crown. Mary had restored them to the Church, but Elizabeth following her royal father's example accepted them at this time, the reason assigned being that the crown had descended to her much encumbered and lessened in revenue.¹

The see of Canterbury having been vacant since the death of cardinal Pole, the learned and excellent Matthew Parker was selected to fill that important post. A native of Norwich, born in 1504, and educated at Cambridge, his name stands eminent in the list of illustrious Englishmen. After his university studies were completed, he devoted some time to the study of the fathers, and cardinal Wolsey observing his diligence, fixed upon him as one of the professors in the college which he intended to found at Oxford, but he declined the offer. Parker, who had been chaplain to queen Anne Boleyn, and afterwards to Henry VIII., was master of one of the colleges at Cambridge, and dean of Lincoln in the reign of Edward VI., but he was deprived of all preferment on the accession of Mary. He never left England, but lived quietly in the eastern counties, though not free from danger, during the storm of persecution in her reign. In the opinion of the English reformers the apostolical succession was of vital importance. Without it the continuity of the Church, and the identity of the present with the past, could not be preserved. The late bishop Wilberforce observes that the English Church bears the mark of no particular man, neither of Luther, nor Calvin, nor Knox, for the highest aim of our reformers was to bring it back to what it had been, and thus they succeeded in restoring to its primitive state, the ancient Church of England.² It was felt that no man was so well qualified for the primacy as Matthew Parker, a man of sound judgment with principles firmly established, who could see how to conciliate opponents without sacrificing essentials. The episcopate in England at this time consisted to a great extent of "vacant bishops," that is, those who had resigned their sees or who had been deprived of them, some by Edward VI., others by Mary.

Parker was elected by the dean and chapter of Canterbury in August, 1559, his election was confirmed at the Church of St. Mary-le-Bow, London, and he was consecrated on the 17th December, by Barlow, formerly bishop of Bath and Wells, now bishop elect of Chichester; Miles Coverdale, late bishop of Exeter; John Scory, formerly bishop of Chichester, now elect of Hereford; and

¹ Collier, vol. vi., p. 223.

² *Essays*, by the late bishop of Winchester, on "The archbishops of Canterbury of the Reformation."

John Hodgkin, suffragan bishop of Bedford. These particulars of doctor Parker's consecration are given because Romanists disputed, and still dispute, the validity of our orders, by asserting that Parker's consecration was not valid, on the ground that the bishops who performed the office had been deprived by Mary of their sees. This, however, did not take away their orders: they were still bishops, and as such were right and proper persons to carry on the episcopal line; for it must be remembered that bishops existed before dioceses were established. More than forty years after Parker's consecration a story was invented, which reflects disgrace on those who originated it, namely, that the bishops elect met at the Nag's Head Tavern, where they were seen by a Romanist, and when Oglethorpe refused to consecrate them, Scory placed a Bible on the head of each, and pronouncing words, "Take thou authority," &c., bade them rise up bishops. The Nag's Head fable is scarcely worthy of notice, and bears above all, this difficulty, that had it been known to the enemies of the Church of England, they would not have delayed its publication for forty years.¹

The other sees were filled up, and the Church began to employ herself in amending those matters which most required it. Towards the close of 1559, injunctions for ordering matters of religion were set forth; it cannot be said with authority by whom they were compiled, but probably by the same divines who revised the Book of Common Prayer. Directions were given for placing tables instead of altars for Holy Communion.²

It has been said by Puritan writers that the clergy generally came into the Reformation with reluctance, but the fact is that the secular or parochial clergy had long murmured at the papal usurpations, although their ignorance frequently made them averse to changing the books to which they had been accustomed, and caused them to prefer repeating the old office, which they knew by heart, to learning the reformed offices which they knew not. Archbishop Heath and other bishops, who were deprived of their preferments, would not have retired so quickly had they not become aware that they could scarcely depend on any support from the clergy. The regular or monastic clergy have been called the pope's militia, but between them and the parochial clergy no friendly feeling existed. The difficulty of finding persons who might be willing to take holy orders, and who were able to fulfil the duties, had been greatly increased by the extreme poverty to which the clergy were reduced, in consequence of the spoliation of church property which had taken place. If the riches of the Church had been too great previous to the Reformation, the sovereigns of the house of Tudor took care such a fault should not again occur. The poverty which prevailed at this time was very injurious to the interests of religion. The necessity of the case induced many

¹ Strype, vol. i., 156. Dean Hook's *Lives of the Archbishops*, vol. iv., new series, p. 204—223.

² Collier, vol. vi., p. 255.

bishops to ordain persons whose attainments did not fit them for so important a charge, though their religious principles were satisfactory. Some were ordained as readers to serve the present necessity of the Church; they were to read the Common Prayer and homilies to the people, but not to baptize, marry, or administer Holy Communion.¹

It has been stated that during the reign of Edward VI. foreign reformers were invited to England, and that many Englishmen fled from this country to the continent soon after Mary came to the throne. They went to Frankfort, Geneva, Zurich, and Strasburg. At Frankfort, where the largest number arrived about June, 1555, a church was granted to them, but on condition that they held it in partnership with the French protestants (or Huguenots, as those of the reformed faith were termed in France), and that they should not disagree with them in matters of doctrine or ceremony. Out of conformity to those French protestants the English exiles gave up many things, and allowed numerous alterations in the service. They then wrote to their English brethren at other places, and invited them to join them, but this the former were not disposed to do. Those at Zurich, in particular, who were mostly men of distinguished learning, declined to go, unless they received an assurance that they should have the full and free use of the liturgy used in England in the reign of Edward VI., and as no guarantee to this effect arrived, the invitation was declined. About this period John Knox came from Geneva to Frankfort, and became the minister of the congregation there for a time. Differences of opinion arose respecting the Book of Common Prayer, and Knox took occasion to submit it to the judgment of the Swiss reformer, Calvin, who had acquired a supremacy almost equal to that of the pope with many of the foreign and some of the English reformers. Calvin's disapproval of the English liturgy produced a great effect upon the congregation at Frankfort, and matters were in this position when doctor Richard Cox, who had been tutor to Edward VI., arrived. He was a man of deep learning and of great credit among his countrymen; and the dissensions between him and Knox, and their respective friends, became serious. The latter declaimed against the English Prayer Book as superstitious, and objected to the litany having been read by one of doctor Cox's friends. Were it not that evil is ever mixed with good, it would appear strange that men could be found who would thus mar the good work that had been begun and carried on amidst such difficulties, and at a time too, when union was strength, and when their dissensions were a source of gratification to their enemies. Through the influence of doctor Cox and his friends, Knox left Frankfort in 1556, but the hostility which he and his followers had aroused against the English liturgy became deeply rooted, and its effects were felt by the Church of England during the whole of the following century. To object to things simply because they have been turned to evil

¹ Bishop Short, p. 236. Strype, vol. i., p. 178. Dean Hook, vol. iv., new series.

purposes shows a want of judgment on the part of the objectors; and if this argument were to be carried out to the end, there is scarcely an institution that might not be swept away. If people look upon rites and ceremonies as the vital part of religion, rather than helps to devotion and a means of making the service of God pleasing, the fault lies in themselves. The reformer Peter Martyr says, "To maintain that all rites and customs practised in the Church of Rome are unlawful cannot be defended, and to govern by such maxims would be a very inconvenient restraint upon the Church of God."¹

The English exiles determined to return to their native country on the accession of Elizabeth, and those who were at Geneva proposed that all should come to a good understanding, as they said they were aware that their differences were a drawback to the cause of reformation, and an advantage to the Romanists. They proposed to arrive at harmony with the rest of the English, but they seemed inclined to make the accommodation upon their own terms.²

It would have been a happy thing had they acted up to their propositions, but on their arrival in England their good intentions failed, and they neglected those rules which had been laid down by authority for the performance of divine service "with decency and order." Some objected to part of the ecclesiastical dress, others to some of the ceremonies of the Church. From their desire to "purify" religion still more, they obtained the name of Puritans. The queen, desirous to check these irregularities, called upon the archbishops and heads of the Church to exert their authority, and induce conformity with the reformed services, as such disagreements produced very bad effects. It will thus be seen that at Elizabeth's accession there were two great parties amongst the English reformers—those who wished to correct abuses in the Church and to return to primitive truth, and those who condemned moderation, and would be content only with demolishing the ancient Church and erecting a sect upon its ruins. In the latter we discover the seed of puritanism and dissent. Amongst the causes which led to these unhappy divisions, the principal one was the work of the Jesuits, who in various disguises fomented discord amongst the members of the reformed religion. The number of foreign protestants who fled for refuge to our island, as an asylum from the cruel persecution of Philip of Spain in Flanders, and the unsettled state of religion in Scotland, combined to introduce disputes which increased rather than diminished during the reign of Elizabeth, and of which the evil fruits became apparent in the following century. The remnants of the ancient Lollards were now merged into the anabaptists, whose sentiments were revolutionary, and it appeared to the statesmen that they sought the overthrow of the Church only as a step towards the overthrow of the throne. There

¹ Berens, ch. iii., quoting Fuller's *Church History*, and Collier, vol. v., p. 389, and vol. vi., p. 144.

² Collier, vol. vi., p. 202.

was a small party, who were simply papists, and ready to receive all the dogmas of the council of Trent.¹

It is said that the court of Spain wished pope Pius IV. to excommunicate queen Elizabeth; but he tried other measures, and sent her a letter in which he expressed his concern for her salvation and honour, begged her as a dear daughter to reject her evil counsellors, and promised if she would return to the bosom of the Romish Church, that he would receive her as the father in the parable did his prodigal son. The authenticity of this letter is questioned by some, but there is an undoubtedly authentic letter from the same pope, in which he made a formal overture to the queen, that on condition of her adhesion to the see of Rome, he would approve of the Book of Common Prayer, including the communion and ordination services. Though he complained that many things were omitted in the book which ought to be there, he admitted that it nevertheless contained nothing contrary to the truth, while it comprehended all that was necessary to salvation. He would, therefore, authorize the Book of Common Prayer, if the queen would receive it from him, and on his authority. The nuncio having sent this letter, waited at Brussels for permission to appear in England, but he received an official intimation that he could not be received, the queen and her counsellors having agreed that it was against the ancient and present laws of the land that he should enter without the consent of parliament, and that his doing so would cause much peril to the nation. The papal party then adopted other means to attain the end they had in view, and those devoted adherents of their cause, the Jesuits, were employed as emissaries to this country. They were directed so to act as to appear enemies of the Church of Rome, while in reality they were hostile to the English reformed communion. They put forward various doctrines, principles, and fancies, calculated to distract the minds of the people, and prejudice them against the liturgy. The plan was clever, for the pope and his advisers knew that the more they could promote diversity of opinion amongst the adherents of the reformed faith, the better it would be for their own purposes. One of these Jesuits was apprehended, and treasonable papers being found on him, he was hanged at York, and when taken to execution, he told the archbishop that his followers would hate the church liturgy as much as his grace hated the Romish forms.²

Another of the Jesuits who was sent over was Heath, brother of the former archbishop of York. He travelled in the disguise of a puritan minister, and distributed anabaptist and other tracts. After a time, he applied to the dean of Rochester for preferment, and preached in the cathedral. Whilst in the pulpit he accidentally dropped a letter, which on being picked up and given to the bishop was found to contain directions as to the best way to draw the

¹ Strype, vol. i., p. 177. Collier, vol. vi., p. 394. Dean Hook, vol. iv., new series, p. 123.

² Strype, vol. i., p. 112, and p. 227—229. Dean Hook, vol. iv., new series.

people to the Church of Rome. His chambers were searched, when a bull of pope Pius V. and a license from his superior were discovered, the chief points in which were instructions how he should act, so as to cause misunderstandings amongst those who held the reformed opinions. Another of these zealous workers for Rome was a Dominican friar, named Faithful Cummins, who in the year 1567 was much admired for his readiness in making long extempore prayers, and for his abuse of pope Pius V. His real character, however, being suspected, he was taken up; but he made his escape and went to Rome, where he told the pope he had done him good service, as he had preached against set forms of prayer, and called the English prayer book the mass book, and had persuaded several that to pray spiritually was to pray extempore; and he added that his words had taken so much with the people, that the Church of England had become as odious to those whom he instructed as the mass was to the Church of England, and that this would be a stumbling block to the English Church while it was a church. The pope commended him and gave him a sum of money.¹

Early in 1563 parliament and convocation met. The proceedings of the latter were important; the articles of religion were passed, which differed very little from the forty-two which were put forth by authority in the reign of Edward VI. They also passed through parliament. The bishops consulted together respecting the better government of their respective churches and clergy. The second book of homilies was now printed. The first book is generally believed to have been written by Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, and two other divines. Bishop Jewel is supposed by some writers to have been chiefly engaged in compiling the second book, but it is also thought that archbishop Parker and others revised and finished the first, and assisted in the second book.²

When the Romanist bishops wrote a letter to the queen requesting her not to be led astray from the "catholic faith planted within this realm by the motherly care of the Church of Rome," Elizabeth's reply was decided. "Our realm and subjects," she wrote, "have long been wanderers walking astray whilst they were under the tuition of the Romish pastors. . . . And whereas you state the Romish Church first planted the catholic faith in our realms, the records of our realms testify to the contrary. . . . When Augustine came from Rome, this country had bishops and priests therein, as is well known to the wise and learned."³

In selecting Parker as her primate the queen showed great sagacity. He had studied the writings of Zwingli, Luther, and Calvin, and knowing their faults as well as their merits, he did not wish to follow their lead. He knew where the Church of Rome had deviated from primitive truth. He could distinguish between

¹ Collier, vol. vi., p. 463. Berens's *History of the Prayer Book*, p. 79.

² Strype, vol. i., p. 345. Bishop Short, p. 239, from Strype's Parker.

³ Dean Hook, vol. iv., p. 193.

things essential and non-essential. When the disciples of Luther and Calvin appeared in England, he was willing to hear what they had to say, not as a disciple, but as a critic. He did not, like the Romanists, consider the fathers of the Church inspired in the same manner as the apostles were, but he looked on them as witnesses to the doctrines universally received by apostolic churches. The principle of deference to ancient tradition and dogma was what distinguished the true catholic from the heretic. One, in interpreting Scripture, had respect to the doctrine of the Church, the other, however ignorant he might be, relied exclusively on his private judgment. Matthew Parker knew that, to preserve the faith first delivered by the apostolic preachers, a constant intercourse was kept up between the bishops in all parts. Irenius informs us there were churches in Europe, Asia, and Africa, in which one and the same tradition was preserved. The letters which passed between them were written in a peculiar form, with some peculiar mark, which served to distinguish the true from the counterfeit. It is from the existence of this principle in the primitive Church that the first four councils have obtained an authority which no subsequent councils have ever possessed. Thus archbishop Parker, and those who coincided with him in seeking the reformation of the Church, regarded themselves as persons representing, and called upon to govern, the old catholic Church of this realm into which they had been baptized, and this—the old catholic Church—they never quitted. In the middle ages corruptions of doctrine and discipline had been gradually introduced, together with gradual but incessant usurpations of popery, and they felt it their duty to free their Church from a foreign power, and bring it back to primitive truth. They never forgot that their position was that of reformers. Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin were, properly speaking, not only reformers but leaders of a great revolution.¹

In 1561 the sittings of the council of Trent, which had been suspended for several years, were resumed. "Protestants" were invited to attend, but not on terms of equality with other sovereigns. Elizabeth would not consent to be classed with the various sects of protestantism. She declared herself to be, notwithstanding her reforms, or rather on account of them—a catholic sovereign. This is intelligible to those who know the true catholic principles, though it may appear strange to those readers or writers who are ignorant of the principles of our Reformation, and of the tenets of our great divines. In reply to a remonstrance from Philip II., the queen said, "An invidious distinction is made between me and such other catholic potentates as have been invited to this congress some time ago. The proposed assembly will not be free. . . . Were it likely to be so I would send to it some religious and zealous persons to represent the Church of England."²

An improved translation of the Bible was published in 1568;

¹ Dean Hook, vol. iv., pp. 134, 55.

² Dean Hook, vol. iv.

the previous one being revised by the most learned of the bishops, who were engaged with archbishop Parker in the work; it was called the bishop's Bible. The following year a smaller edition was published in order that private families might be supplied with it. The archbishop was so pleased with the completion of this work that he used Simeon's words, and said, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace."¹

In 1569 pope Pius V., despairing of regaining Elizabeth to the Romanist cause, proceeded to issue against her a bull of excommunication, in which he absolved her subjects from their allegiance. In this bull she is spoken of as the "pretended queen of England, that vassal of iniquity," whose mind was so hardened that she "refused to admit the nuncio sent to her from the holy see." Up to this time only such ecclesiastics as declined the oath of supremacy (and who mostly went abroad) had withdrawn themselves from the reformed services of the Church, while a great part of the Roman catholic laity had been reconciled to our communion by the review of the Common Prayer, and the decency and solemnity of the service. Thus for the first ten years of Elizabeth's reign they came frequently to the parish churches, but the bull of pope Pius V. checked this, and afterwards foreign clergy, and Englishmen educated and ordained abroad, were sent over to England; colleges for English Romanists being established on the continent, in order that missionaries for this country might be provided.² The colleges of Douay and St. Omers were founded by Philip II. of Spain, and in 1579 a college for the same purpose was founded at Rome by pope Gregory XIII., and during the next century others were established in Spain and Flanders. Doctor Allen, who afterwards became cardinal, was the head of Douay college, and so well did this and the college at Rome progress, that in a few years above three hundred Jesuit priests had been sent from thence into England.³

John Jewel, who is one of the most celebrated writers of our Church, was made bishop of Salisbury in 1560. During the summer of that year he preached in the pulpit at St. Paul's Cross, where "good old father Latimer" used to deliver his soul-stirring addresses to the people. Jewel's discourses stated the errors into which the Church of Rome had fallen, and this challenge gave rise to various controversies, but he proved himself equal to the occasion. In 1562 bishop Jewel published in Latin his celebrated "Apology for the Church of England," which appeared in English at about the same time. In June, 1559, Jewel had preached a sermon at Paul's Cross, which excited great attention. He declared that where Rome differed from England, Rome was medieval, and England primitive in her doctrines. What was medieval was comparatively new, what was new could not be primitive. The Church of England interpreted Scripture by the light of primitive tradition,

¹ Berens, p. 77.

² Collier, vol. vi., pp. 471, 264. Bishop Short, p. 273. Also *Key to Church History*, edited by Blunt, p. 45.

³ Collier, vol. vi., p. 470.

and he said in his *Apology*, "We are come as near as we possibly could to the Church of the apostles, and the old catholic bishops and fathers." This was Jewel's principle. This is the principle of the Anglican communion as distinguished from the foreign re-formations; not Luther, not Calvin, but the primitive Church.¹

We may now consider the great work of the Reformation of England's Church completed. The alterations that had been effected in her services and discipline had been approved by the sovereign as the ruler of the state, by parliament as representing the laity, and by convocation as representing the clergy of the realm. We have said that for the first ten years of Elizabeth's reign the Romanists had not withdrawn from the Church, and the moderation shown to them by her government in an age when the principles of toleration were unknown, was both remarkable and praiseworthy; but the conduct of the popes, and the rebellions which took place in the north of England, and in Ireland, together with attempts real or supposed against the life of the queen, caused the Romanists to be looked on afterwards with suspicious eyes.

We must now return to the affairs of Scotland. It will be remembered that Mary of Guise, the queen-regent, died in 1560. The young queen, her daughter, had married a French prince, who was now Francis II., king of France. The Scottish parliament met in the summer, and a petition was laid before it, desiring that the supremacy of the pope and the leading errors of the Church of Rome be condemned, and that the revenues of the Church be employed in supporting the reformed ministry, schools, &c. The first portion of the petition was passed, but the latter clause which related to giving back to religious purposes the church patrimony which they had appropriated, was very unacceptable to the nobility, and they gave no reply to it. A confession of faith was drawn up and adopted, and John Knox and others prepared a scheme of church government, called the first book of discipline, in which the clergy were divided into three heads—superintendents, parochial clergy, and readers. The superintendents, ten in number, were appointed to ten dioceses; they were intended to execute several of the duties which belong to the episcopal office, and all parish priests were bound to obey them. Knox was not an enemy to prelacy, considered as an ancient and apostolical institution; no one was more convinced than he, that, to use the words he adopted from Calvin, "parity (or equality of ministers) breedeth confusion;" and the office of superintendent was invested with some of the power and dignity which belong to bishops. This is admitted, but it has been said that the arrangement was not meant to be permanent. It appears, however, in this first book of discipline, that rules were laid down for supplying vacancies by election when

¹ Dean Hook, vol. iv., p. 276. Also see the works of bishop Jewel, edition Parker Society. The "Apology" was translated by lady Bacon, d. of Sir Anthony Cook, who had been preceptor to Edward VI. All his daughters were good Latin and Greek scholars. One of them was Mildred, the wife of queen Elizabeth's great minister, Cecil. Note in Dean Hook, vol. iv., new series, p. 283.

a superintendent died or was deposed. The term bishop had become offensive to the people as being associated in their minds with luxury, corrupt doctrine, and idleness. But if the superintendent scheme had been fully carried out, it would have borne only a slight external resemblance to the ancient episcopate. Unordained themselves, the superintendents could not ordain others; appointed by the ministers and people, and liable to be deposed by them, they neither possessed nor claimed distinct independent jurisdiction. Though there were still different orders of ministers, the distinction between laymen and clergy had been in many cases condemned as a popish prejudice, and in this book of discipline no laying on of hands was required; every man might take upon himself the ministerial office, provided he did not belong to the Church of Rome, and felt called to the office by his zeal, and provided he was elected or nominated by the parishioners, received a verbal appointment by the presiding divine to the charge of the congregation, and passed a certain examination as to morals and the gift of preaching. A complaint is made in this book of the church revenues having been taken away, and it is said that "some gentlemen are now more rigorous in exacting tithes and other dues than even the papists were, so that the tyranny of the priests is turned into the tyranny of the lords and lairds." Knox was much opposed to the robbery of the Church's revenues, but his opposition was in vain. The service of the Church during this period was chiefly liturgical. The prayer book of Edward VI., which had been ordered by the lords of the congregation for use, had been employed for some years, but the reformed preachers did not restrict themselves to it. In fact, during this period of transition from old to new, the form generally used possessed the character of a directory, rather than a liturgy. The minister might use his own words when he thought it desirable. Knox preferred the form employed at Geneva, which has frequently been called by his name, and also known as the old Scottish liturgy, and at a general assembly held at Edinburgh, 1564, this was directed to be used generally. Knox used set forms of prayer in his family, and his servant, Richard Bannatyne, says in his journal that a few hours before his master expired, he repeated aloud the Lord's prayer and the belief.¹

Queen Mary and her husband were much incensed at the proceedings of Knox and his friends, and these feelings were increased by the influence of their relatives, the princes of Lorraine. The king of France died December, 1560, after which event that kingdom interested itself much less in the affairs of Scotland, and the widowed queen felt the necessity of gaining the sympathy and affections of her Scottish people.

As the ecclesiastical edifices were looked upon as relics of superstition, an act was passed in 1561 for the destruction of all monasteries and other buildings which had been polluted by the

¹ Russell, vol. i., ch. vi. Collier, vol. vi., pp. 324, 590. Grub, vol. ii., pp. 99, 100.

service of the mass. The execution of this order was committed to four nobles who were most distinguished for their antipathy to the Romanist usages; the earls of Argyle, Arran, and Glencairn, and lord James Stuart, afterwards the well-known regent, earl of Murray.

No corner of the kingdom seems to have escaped them; abbeys, cathedrals, churches, libraries, records, and even tombs perished in one general ruin,¹ and their acts shewed them to be persons who

“Call fire and sword, and desolation,
A godly, thorough Reformation.”

In the summer of 1561 the young queen of Scots returned to her kingdom; a widow, not yet twenty years old. The change to Mary must have been great from the gay city of Paris, with its splendid court and more advanced civilization, to a northern climate, a turbulent nobility, and a people prejudiced against her on account of her religion, and with all her faults and failings it is impossible not to pity her position; a sovereign in name only, for the power was in other hands. Though soon after her return she issued a proclamation, directing every one to submit to the established faith and give no disturbance to the preachers, she herself was not allowed the same liberty. Even amidst the rejoicings when she arrived in her capital, insults to her religion were displayed, attacks were made on her from the pulpits, and Knox in one of his interviews with her, after stating that her uncles, the princes of Lorraine, were enemies to God and Christ, added, that he had not time to attend to her request; that he would give her his advice in private, when he thought her wrong. “I am called, madam,” he said, “to a public function within the kirk of God. . . . I am not appointed to come to each in particular to show his offence, for that labour were infinite. If your grace frequents the public sermons, ye shall fully understand what I like and what I mislike in your majesty as in all others.”²

Doubtless, the French alliance had been unfortunate for Mary and her country. It was openly debated, whether being an “idol-atress,” she was entitled to any authority. The mass was always spoken of as idolatry, and Knox persecuted the Romanists on the broad principle that being idolaters they were worthy of death. The queen was required to join the reformed faith and have it established in the kingdom; she refused the first, and hoped her subjects would not press her to receive any religion against her conscience, but consented to the second proposition, provided it was agreed to by the proper authorities. On one occasion Mary entreated Knox to use his influence to save some Romanists from death, but he refused.³

Regal authority had sunk to the lowest ebb in Scotland. In

¹ Russell, vol. i., p. 257. Collier, vol. vi., p. 330.

² Russell, vol. i., p. 258, from *Life of Knox*.

³ Russell, vol. i., p. 263.

1563, when the queen was absent, and a priest was saying mass in the royal chapel at Holyrood before some of her household, the populace broke open the gates, seized some of the worshippers and dragged them to prison. The queen's resentment was great, and two of those who had been most active in this outrage were committed to prison. Knox, who looked upon them as martyrs suffering in a good cause, issued letters requiring those who professed the true religion, to come to Edinburgh on the day of their trial to comfort and assist them. This summons the privy council considered to be an act of treason, and they resolved to prosecute Knox, but the noblemen before whom he came had acted in a similar manner in recent times, when they wished to intimidate the government. Knox urged this in his defence, and so he was fully acquitted by them.¹

In 1564, the queen married lord Darnley, by whom she had one son, who was afterwards James VI. of Scotland and James I. of England. The party opposed to her were her opponents both on political and religious grounds; the preachers never forgave her adherence to the religion in which she had been educated. The queen of England, whose animosity she had aroused when in France, by claiming the crown and quartering the arms of England, looked upon her as a dangerous rival, and indirectly encouraged the rebellious disposition of her subjects. The murder of Darnley, and Mary's subsequent marriage to the earl of Bothwell, who was strongly suspected of being concerned in that dark deed, finally alienated the affections of her subjects; but these events can only be glanced at as they do not enter into Church history. During the insurrection which took place, Mary surrendered herself at Carberry Hill to the "associated lords," whose conduct towards her was inexcusable; they broke the promises by which she had been induced to surrender; she was treated with the greatest severity, and loaded with insults, and placed in the hands of her worst enemies, by whom she was conveyed to the gloomy castle of Lochleven. Here, in 1567, she was compelled by lord Lindsay and others to resign the crown in favour of her infant son, and the kingdom was again placed in the hands of a regent—lord James Stuart, now earl of Murray. The young prince was immediately crowned, and John Knox preached the sermon on the occasion. Mary escaped from Lochleven by the assistance of George Douglas, brother of her keeper, and a party of her friends rallied round her. She declared that the resignation of her crown had been forced from her, and a battle was fought near Glasgow, in May, 1568, between her troops and those of the regent, in which the latter were victorious. Mary then, contrary to the advice of her friends, fled into England and threw herself on the protection of Elizabeth. There she was an unwelcome visitor, for the English queen, though willing to expostulate with the rebel lords on their conduct to their sovereign, had no desire to grant an asylum to a beautiful and ac-

¹ Russell, vol. i., p. 265. Collier, vol. vi., p. 390.

complished rival, who was doubly dangerous, as her nearness to the throne and her religion made her a rallying point for the Romanist party.

Soon after the earl of Murray became regent, a parliament was held; the authority of the pope and the Romish services were abolished, and all was settled to the satisfaction of the ministers, except the matter of the church funds. The regent dared not risk the anger of the nobles (who had enriched themselves at the expense of the clergy) by requiring them to give up the property which they had seized.¹ Spiritual despotism in Scotland did not end with popery. The era of toleration had not arrived. It was still deemed treason to the true belief to allow any other to exist; but though these first reformers did not tolerate other views, a foundation of mutual forbearance was laid by them, as the practice of appealing to Scripture showed at length the inconsistency of inviting men to inquire, and then punishing them for the difference of opinion which that inquiry might occasion.²

After the year 1560, the congregation, as they were in the habit of styling themselves, had a certain right to be looked on as the established Church of Scotland; but the assassination of the regent Murray, and his successor, Lennox, delayed the settlement of religious affairs, and afforded another proof of the lawless state of the Scottish kingdom. In 1572 a convention or general assembly of the kirk took place at Leith. Some of the most learned of the clergy were selected, to consult with a deputation from the earl of Mar who had become regent, and it was arranged that the titles of archbishop and bishop should be restored, that the dioceses as they before existed should be given to such as were best qualified for the office, and that the ministers should take an oath acknowledging the king's authority and promising obedience to their bishop. To soothe the feelings of those who felt a prejudice against these titles it was declared that by restoring the names of bishop, archbishop, &c., no countenance to popery was intended. The system proposed bore a general resemblance to the external government of the Church as it existed previous to the Scottish Reformation, and as it was sanctioned by law in England; but there was one deficiency which made the new arrangement a mere empty form. Though the bishops were required to be consecrated, those persons who were appointed to consecrate them had not themselves received the gift which they were directed to bestow on others. Thus the bishops' sees were filled by those to whom the name only of bishop belonged. These arrangements received the approbation of Knox, though some of the presbyterian historians, displeased at the revival of episcopal titles, deny that the proceedings of the assembly at Leith were regular.³

In the year 1572, death removed the regent Mar and the veteran

¹ Russell, vol. i., p. 274.

² Ibid., p. 316.

³ Russell, vol. i., ch. viii. Collier, vol. vi., p. 512.

reformer Knox. The death of Mar was a loss to the Church, as he seems to have wished to place her interests on a firm footing. Of the sincerity and boldness of Knox there can be no doubt; he was zealous in exposing error, and he carried out his opinions with the utmost determination. We must, however, lament his hard and violent character, the little regard that he showed for the views and the interests of others, and the studied discourtesy with which he treated his sovereign, whose youth and sex merited gentler treatment. He lived in a stormy age, which required the courage of the lion, and which was not in his case combined with the gentleness of the lamb. His talents were well suited to raise him to eminence in a time of civil and religious commotion; few were able to resist his stern impassioned eloquence, which impressed his friends with awe and his enemies with terror.¹ Another writer says, it is by his actions and writings that we are best able to judge of Knox's character. His opinions were avowed and acted on with stern uprightness; but the persecuting tenets and claim to infallibility, which he denounced in the Church of Rome, he defended and sought to carry out in the cause he advocated. And he had recourse to worse weapons in defence of the Reformation; he corresponded with the rulers of a foreign state, and abetted plots and conspiracies against his sovereign. Another stain in his character was the harsh language, the slanderous accusations which he used against his opponents, and this not only in regard to his persecutors; for Mary of Guise never encouraged persecution, and her unfortunate daughter was scarcely able to obtain toleration for herself; yet Knox nourished towards both a feeling of malignity which no persuasions could appease and no sufferings diminish. The angry passions which he encouraged were as much opposed to the rules of the gospel as were the vices which he justly rebuked. And some of the worst deeds which stained the Scottish history in the following age were justified by an appeal to his principles and example.² John Knox was twice married. He had two sons, both of whom were educated in England; one took holy orders in the English Church, the other became a fellow of his college at Cambridge. His daughters married Scottish ministers.

¹ Russell, vol. i., p. 337.

² Grub, vol. ii., p. 186—188.

CHAPTER XXV.

CENTURY XVI.

FROM THE MASSACRE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW, A.D. 1572, TO THE
DEATH OF ELIZABETH, A.D. 1603.

THE Huguenots in France had been subject to great persecution, but this did not check the progress of the reformed doctrines in that country. The same may be said of Holland and the Netherlands, where Philip II. of Spain, to whose crown that country then belonged, set up a branch of the Inquisition. The horrible cruelties which were committed there under the pretence of religion, have handed down the name of Philip and his minister the duke of Alva, to the execration of mankind; while the gallant stand made by the inhabitants under their noble chief, William of Orange, forms one of the most interesting portions of history. But that which excited men's minds in an extraordinary degree was the massacre of the Huguenots in France on Saint Bartholomew's Day, the 24th of August, 1572. A marriage had been arranged between the princess Margaret of France and Henry king of Navarre, who was the chief of the reformed party. As this was looked upon as a great step towards a reconciliation between the French court and the Huguenots, the heads of the latter assembled in Paris to celebrate the event, where they were treated with the greatest kindness and attention in outward appearances by the French king and his mother Catherine de Medici; but this was only the lull which preceded the storm. On the 19th of August, the day after the marriage, a secret council was held, in which it was determined to proclaim a general massacre of the Huguenots. The signal in Paris was the ringing of the tocsin or great bell of the city, in the dead of night, which was immediately followed by the first shot. So secretly had the arrangements been made that none of the devoted party were prepared to defend themselves. Firing was heard in every quarter; the houses of the Huguenots, which had been previously marked, were broken into and their inmates slaughtered; those who escaped into the streets meeting death there. The king himself fired upon them from the windows of his palace. For three days the massacre continued; lifeless bodies blocked the doorways, thousands were thrown into the river, till at length a dead silence fell upon the streets of Paris. These dreadful events were followed by similar deeds in all the principal towns of France. Some writers say that 70,000, others that 100,000 persons were slain. Catherine de Medici wrote to announce the event to Philip II., to Alva, and to the pope. Gregory XIII. and his cardinals returned thanks to God, and a medal was struck at Rome to com-

memorate the proceedings.¹ But this feeling was not shared by all Romanists; and when the governor of one of the French cities received the royal order for the massacre, he replied, "Your majesty has many faithful subjects here, but not one executioner."

The Huguenots were at first stunned by this blow, but those who were able to escape by sea, landed in England, and this was particularly the case with the artisans. The Huguenot nobles and gentry would not abandon their followers, and a civil war ensued which was only concluded, in 1594, by the succession of the king of Navarre to the throne of France as Henry IV. He published two years later the celebrated edict of Nantes, which, after sixty years of persecution, gave the Huguenots comparative liberty of conscience and freedom of worship.²

Charles IX. gave as an excuse for his atrocious measures that a conspiracy against him by the Huguenots had been discovered, and he desired his ambassador in England to give the queen this reason. For several days she refused to see him, and the ambassador, though obliged to give this apology, felt ashamed of the task imposed upon him. His reception at the English court was most solemn and affecting; as he passed through the palace to the royal presence sorrow was seen on every face; the courtiers and ladies were dressed in deep mourning, silence prevailed, and no salute or favourable look was bestowed upon him.³

Elizabeth was fully aware of the dangers to which she was exposed as the head of the reformed party in Europe. The French and Spanish monarchs were particularly offended at the asylum which their persecuted subjects found in England. Though they would not allow them freedom of conscience in their own country, they could not endure their leaving it to obtain that freedom elsewhere. The ambassadors of these two monarchs acted as spies in the English court, and stirred up discontent amongst the queen's subjects. The French king demanded that Elizabeth should banish the fugitives from her realm, and Philip II. called upon the pope to interfere, who in a letter addressed to the queen denounced the refugees as drunkards and sectaries. Bishop Jewel answered this attack, saying, "Is it so heinous a thing to show mercy? These people live not idly. They beg only to breathe our air and see our sun. They labour truthfully. They live sparingly. They are examples of faith and patience. The towns wherein they abide are happy, for God doth follow them with his blessings."⁴

In May, 1575, archbishop Parker breathed his last. It has been justly said of him that "he was well fitted by nature and education for ruling the Church of England through a stormy period of her history, and . . . the vessel he was called upon to pilot has been saved almost entirely by his skill from breaking on the rock

¹ *The Huguenots*, by Samuel Smiles, p. 68—72.

² *The Huguenots*, Smiles, p. 74—76.

³ Hume, ch. xl., p. 58.

⁴ *The Huguenots*, Smiles, p. 79, quoting bishop Jewel's works (Parker society), pp. 1148, 1149.

of medieval superstition, or drifting into the whirlpool of unbelief."¹ The puritans pursued him by their hatred even after death, for his monument was demolished by them in the reign of Charles I., his body dug up, and his bones buried in a dunghill. After the restoration of Charles II., Sir William Dugdale, bringing the matter to the notice of archbishop Sancroft, the bones were removed and re-interred in Lambeth church. Parker's character has been traduced by puritan writers, whose sentiments have too often been adopted by popular historians, and repeated, until at length they have been taken for granted by those who affect to consider ecclesiastical affairs unworthy of particular inquiry. But to this primate, together with the queen and her minister Cecil, we are indebted under God's providence for the preservation of the Church of England in its vital and essential principles.²

In Parker's time the reformed or Anglo-catholic Church of England was opposed by the puritans who represented Calvinism, a large number of whom were influenced by John Knox, and eventually they became opposed to the continuance of episcopacy. When friendly intercourse ceased between England and Rome, the Church, though continuing to be as she always had been the catholic Church of this country, became protestant also; catholic, through her apostolical succession—protestant, in the sense of protesting against the errors of Rome; and thus she has been attacked by two parties³—by Rome for her protestantism, by puritans and ultra-protestants for her primitive doctrines and catholicism.

The monastic clergy had been destroyed as a body in England. Some went abroad, some entered aristocratic families as chaplains, where they did much harm to the cause of the Reformation. The queen of Scots was the rallying point of the English Romanists. When she fled from her rebellious subjects into England, she was no welcome visitor to the queen, whose crown she had formerly claimed, and whose arms she had quartered with her own. She was also next in succession to the throne, and her religion and personal attractions combined to make her a dangerous rival. When Elizabeth heard of Mary's arrival, she directed the lord lieutenant of the county of Cumberland to take her to Carlisle. She was afterwards removed to Fotheringay castle, Northamptonshire, where she was detained a prisoner for nearly nineteen years. The duke of Norfolk, a Roman catholic, and one of the most powerful of the English peers, wished to marry her, and formed a conspiracy for her liberation; but the attempt was suppressed, and the duke was sent to the tower and executed in 1572. Another Romanist conspiracy, in which a gentleman of family and influence in Derbyshire took part, and which has been called by his name Babington's conspiracy, was formed with the design of assassinating Elizabeth and placing Mary on the English throne. This

¹ Archdeacon Hardwick, quoted by Dean Hook in *Lives of Archbishops*, vol. iv. (new series), p. 587.

² Dean Hook, vol. iv., p. 584.

³ Dean Hook, vol. iv.

was discovered through the vigilance of the queen's ministers. There is no doubt that Mary was in some degree implicated in the plot, and the discovery was fatal to her. She was tried and condemned to death; and in one of the halls of Fotheringay castle in February, 1587, Mary Stuart was beheaded. Thus, at the age of forty-five, ended the life of this unfortunate queen, whose execution is generally considered a dark blot on the memory of her relative, Elizabeth.

Fugitives from France and the Netherlands continued to arrive in England. Few brought any property, but they brought intelligence, skill, and the spirit of independence—qualities which made them valuable subjects. A large part of the Netherlands which had been so prosperous, and whose people were great as artists and merchants, had been made desolate by the Spanish armies. Its best citizens had fled into England, and as Elizabeth had helped them in their gallant struggle, Philip II. at length resolved to take vengeance upon this country. Possessed of a most powerful army and navy, and, since the discovery of America, the richest monarch in Europe, he believed himself able to expel the heretic queen, whose power and spirit was the hope of the reformed churches. Immense preparations were made, and in 1588 he sent forth from the shores of Spain his great armada, a fleet such as had never before been equalled. It consisted of one hundred and thirty ships, and had on board, besides the soldiers and sailors, one hundred and eighty priests and monks under a vicar-general of the Inquisition. The expedition was blessed by the pope, and the bull of Pius V. was republished with additional threats. All Europe now imagined that Elizabeth and the reformed Church of England were doomed to destruction.¹

To meet this force the queen had only twenty-eight small men-of-war; but her sailors were accustomed to danger, and were far superior to the Spaniards in courage and dexterity. This threatened invasion by a foreign power, and one so hated as Spain, roused every heart. All united to meet the common danger. The citizens of London fitted out thirty small ships instead of fifteen, which had been required of them. The nobility and gentry armed and manned vessels at their own expense. Along the south coast all took arms, and the general rising and arming by land and sea, extended to Scotland. The force intended to protect London was stationed on the Thames, and the queen herself went to Tilbury to inspect it. She rode through the lines exhorting them to remember their duty to their religion and their country, and professed her intention, though a woman, to lead them herself against the enemy, and perish in battle rather than survive the ruin and slavery of her people. "I know," said she, "I have but the weak and feeble arm of a woman, but I have the heart of a king, and of a king of England too."

The sacred and invincible armada, as the Spaniards called it, ap-

¹ *The Huguenots*, by Smiles, p. 90.

proached the English shores, sailing in the form of a crescent, which stretched a distance of seven miles from end to end. The English fleet, under the command of Lord Howard of Effingham and Sir Francis Drake, was lying in Plymouth sound when news was brought them of its approach. The size of the Spanish vessels did not benefit them; it exposed them to our guns, whilst their cannon fired over the heads of the English men-of-war. The armada passed up the channel continually harassed by our ships, and the fleet of small vessels which swarmed out of our ports, till at length it reached Calais, where it was to be joined by another fleet with troops under the duke of Parma, viceroy of the Netherlands. Here the English admiral filled eight small vessels with combustibles and sent them into the middle of the enemy, who, knowing the danger of these fire-ships, cut their cables and fled in disorder. The English fell upon them while in confusion, took or destroyed several of their ships, and damaged others. The duke of Parma did not leave the harbour, and the Spanish admiral sailed towards the north of our island, followed by our vessels till their ammunition failed. A violent storm overtook the remains of the armada; many of the ships were wrecked upon the coasts of Scotland and Ireland, and the crews of those who were able to return to Spain were so overcome with hardship and fatigue and so dispirited by their failure, that they filled Spain with accounts of the desperate valour of the English, and the tempestuous violence of their seas. Thus was our country preserved by Providence from a foreign yoke and papal tyranny.

Amongst the different sects which now divide Christians none made a greater stir than the anabaptists. They acquired their name from their practice of re-baptizing all those who came over to their communion; as they did not look upon those who had been baptized in infancy or at a tender age as true members of the Christian Church. They have claimed to be descended from the Waldenses and other ancient sects, who, in the twelfth century, strove to reform themselves from the errors of popery. A sect called the Pedrobrussians rose in that century under Pedro de Bruys in France, who was burnt at St. Giles in London, in 1130. They held some of the tenets of the Dutch anabaptists, and rejected infant baptism. But it is difficult to trace the real origin of the anabaptists, which is not surprising, as this sect started up suddenly in several countries at the same time under different leaders, when the first contests between the reformers and the popes of Rome drew the attention of the world to that one absorbing topic, so that other matters became matters of indifference. Their progress was rapid, but it is uncertain whether they first arose in Switzerland, Germany, or the Netherlands; and they were divided into various parties; for though they all agreed in planning a new and perfect church and in opposing the baptism of infants, and re-baptizing all who had received that sacrament in infancy, yet they differed from each other in several points. The worst portion of this sect was that which, pretending that they were directed by a divine impulse, rose in

1521 under the guidance of Munzer and others, and excited terrible tumults in Saxony and the neighbouring countries. They preached, exhorted, and related visions; but, finding that the ministry of Luther and other reformers was not favourable to their cause, they attempted to extend their opinions by force of arms. In 1525 Munzer and his companions assembled an army, if a rabble composed of peasants from Saxony, &c., can be so called, and, placing themselves at their head, they declared war against all laws, governments, and magistrates, under the idea that Christ was to take all government into his own hands and rule over the nations. The elector of Saxony and other princes dispersed this crowd, and their ringleader was put to death. Many of them continued to wander about Germany, Switzerland, and Holland, and excited the people to rebellion, gathering congregations in many places, and foretelling the downfall of rulers and governors. It must not be supposed, however, that all who held anabaptist opinions were guilty of these acts; many were men of sincere piety, though mistaken in their views, into which they were led by ignorance and by a wish to reform the corrupt state of religion. Unfortunately, the part taken by the violent section of these people alarmed and raised against them kings, princes, and governors; most severe edicts were passed, and death itself inflicted.

This did not check them; for in the year 1533 certain Dutch anabaptists, under the leadership of a tailor called John of Leyden, and others, gained possession of the town of Munster, which they declared was to be the seat of the new Jerusalem. They deposed the magistrates and committed enormous crimes and follies. In 1536 the city was retaken after a long siege, and John of Leyden and his chief followers were put to death. Their pernicious doctrines were the cause of such dreadful calamities, that most severe measures were employed to root them out.

About this time their ranks were joined by a Dutchman of the name of Menno Simon, who had been a Romanist priest. He at first attended their meetings with secrecy; but, after publicly embracing their communion, he became a teacher, and gained great influence amongst them. He was possessed of much eloquence, honest and zealous, and travelled from one country to another for twenty-five years, gaining a great number of followers wherever he exercised his ministry. The anabaptists, who had been accustomed to leaders who resembled madmen rather than Christian ministers, and who had been led by them into so many troubles, were rejoiced to find a teacher who appeared to promise them more prosperous days. His plan of doctrine and discipline was far more moderate than that of the furious leaders we have mentioned. He condemned their licentious tenets with regard to polygamy and divorce, as well as their general system, which had been founded on the idea of a new kingdom to be established by Christ on the ruins of civil governments, and the destruction of human rulers, and which had been the cause of such dreadful commotions and crimes. In consequence of Menno's influence, the different parties of ana-

baptists agreed together to exclude from their communion those fanatics who had dishonoured it; they renounced those tenets that were adverse to the authority of civil government and formed themselves into one community. They afterwards disowned their descent from the followers of Munzer and John of Leyden, whose doings had made the name of their sect odious. History, however, proves that Menno's first congregations were composed not only of the more sober and quiet portion, but also of that violent party which had been distinguished in the proceedings of Munzer and his associates.¹

The Mennonites, or anabaptists, obtained a settlement in Holland under a legal toleration procured for them by William, prince of Orange, whom they had assisted with money in 1572 during his struggle with Philip II.; but this toleration was opposed by many of the leading men in those provinces who had not forgotten the former disturbances caused by the sect. Their liberty was, however, finally established when they published a confession of faith in 1626, in which they cleared themselves from the hateful errors which had been laid to their charge.

The anabaptists came into England in the reign of Elizabeth, and were called baptists.² It is fair to state that the modern sect of baptists disown any connection with the fanatics led by Munzer and John of Leyden. They seem to have arisen out of a secession from the independents in the seventeenth century, and are divided into particular or Arminian, and general or Calvinistic baptists. Their confession of faith was published in 1643.

We have said that the Romanists did not separate from the Church in England for the first ten years of Elizabeth's reign; though they might not have approved of all the alterations made, they could raise no sound objections, and Lord Montacute, a "devout follower of the Romish religion," stated at the court of Rome "that no other religion was brought into England than that which was consonant with the Holy Scriptures and the four first œcumenical councils."³ But this state of things was altered after the bull of pope Pius V. in 1569, which forbade the queen's subjects to obey the commands of her whom he had excommunicated; and a Romanist named Felton affixed the bull to the gates of the palace of the bishop of London the following year. This caused acts to be passed against the Romanists, though they were not then put into execution. The "seminary" priests, who came into England from the colleges at Douay, Rome, &c., were actively engaged in the treasonable practices against the queen and her government. The massacre in France, the persecution in the Netherlands, the preparations made by Philip II. to subjugate England, and the inducements to rebellion held out by the pope to Elizabeth's Romanist subjects, all combined to cause measures of severity to be adopted

¹ Mosheim, vol. iii., p. 318—332.

² Mosheim, vol. iv., p. 346.

³ Camden's *Elizabeth*, quoted by bishop Short, p. 274.

towards them by her government. This severity is to be regretted; but it was forced upon the queen in self-defence. The Romanists of modern times rebaptize and re-ordain those who join their communion; but this was not done until a comparatively recent date. The earliest instance of re-ordination occurred in 1704.¹

A spirit of discord had in the mean time arisen amongst the reformers. When essential points had been settled, trifling matters of dress and ceremonies produced contention. In any great change of opinion men are apt to run into extremes, and some time is required before reason returns. The residence of our divines at Geneva introduced them to some great scholars; but this advantage was counterbalanced by the influence which John Calvin obtained over them. The puritans began to clamour for the abolition of set forms of prayer, and to raise objections to the function if not to the name of episcopacy. The queen's minister, Cecil, supported the Church; her favourite, the earl of Leicester, lent his influence to the puritans, who had some friends at the council board to support them. Archbishop Parker's character was conciliatory, but Leicester was his enemy, and, though actuated by different motives, he aided the puritans in their opposition to the Church; they worked under the influence of pious, though mistaken, principles; he, because he hoped through their means to obtain a further share of plunder.²

Edmund Grindal, archbishop of York, who was born at St. Bees, in Cumberland, about 1519, succeeded Parker in the see of Canterbury. St. Bees had been eminent as a place of devotion in very early times, and a theological college has of late years been founded there. Grindal was educated at Cambridge, and became chaplain to Ridley when the latter was bishop of London. His connection with the martyr made it prudent for him to leave England early in the reign of Mary, which he did with the approbation of bishop Ridley. While on the continent, he fell to a certain degree under the influence of Calvin, whose genius and learning fascinated many; but the intolerant and despotic temper of that reformer rendered Geneva uncongenial to Grindal, and he took up his abode at Strassburg, where he kept up an intimacy with his German and Swiss friends. He assisted Foxe, the martyrologist, in obtaining information respecting the sufferings of Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, and attended the lectures delivered at Strassburg by Peter Martyr. On the accession of queen Elizabeth, Grindal returned to England, where he was cordially welcomed, especially by Parker. In principles these two divines were agreed; each considered it their duty to correct the abuses which had crept into the Church, but not to create a new sect. Grindal, however, did not possess the strong and vigorous character of his friend. "He was," says the author we are quoting, "a conscientious man, and so afraid of doing wrong that he often omitted to do what was right." As regarded the puritans, his conduct was

¹ Bishop Short, p. 274. Dean Hook, vol. iv., p. 319.

² Bishop Short, ch. ix. Dean Hook, vol. iv. (new series).

vacillating, which was a serious error in a ruler of the Church in those days. Grindal at first hesitated about accepting a bishopric, but was present at the consecration of archbishop Parker, and became bishop of London shortly afterwards. In 1570 he was made archbishop of York, and in 1575 succeeded to the see of Canterbury. A certain religious exercise, known in history as "prophesyings," had commenced when Parker was archbishop, and we who live in the nineteenth century may find it difficult to understand the objections made to them. Their intention was good, but the managers of these meetings of the clergy appear to have encouraged discussions which were neither edifying nor improving, and both the queen and the archbishop perceived that they might pass from theological discussions to political debate. The prophesyings were put down, and the queen requested archbishop Grindal to prevent their recurrence. He thought they might be turned to a good use if the evils were corrected and the abuses guarded against. The queen could ill brook opposition to her will, and the difference of opinion on this subject between her majesty and the primate impaired his usefulness, and embittered the latter years of his life.

In one of the archbishop's letters to the queen during these discussions the following striking passages occur: "When your majesty hath questions of the laws of your realm, you send them to your judges to be determined. Likewise for doubts in matters of doctrine or discipline of the Church, the usual way is to refer the decision of these points to the bishops. Remember, madam, that you are a mortal creature. And though you are a mighty prince, yet remember that He who dwelleth in heaven is mightier." The archbishop observed that the prophesyings had done good, as the ministers had become more knowing in the Scriptures, and better qualified to instruct their people. He noticed the scarcity of qualified preachers owing to the difficulty of providing a maintenance to support the vicars of parishes; this difficulty being caused by the "sacrilege which kept pace with the Reformation," as the impropriations had been granted away to laymen. The archbishop was ready to correct any abuses in the conduct of the prophesyings, but declined to suppress them.

The queen received hints from various quarters that even her most loyal subjects were inclined to uphold the primate. The members of convocation still retained the privilege which they had possessed from time immemorial of granting or withholding a subsidy, and the queen, therefore, wished to avoid a controversy with the clergy. She at length softened in her feelings towards the archbishop, and he appears to have modified his opinion of the prophesyings, as he found from some of his suffragans that more harm than good was done by them in their dioceses. Grindal was afflicted by loss of sight and failing health, and was about to resign the primacy, when his death took place at Croydon, July, 1583. He did not forget his native county, having founded a school at St. Bees; some of the colleges in Cambridge also benefited by his liberality. Sacred music had now attained to much

perfection, as the names of Bird, Morley, and Tallis testify, and the archbishop was a great patron of the art. In 1561, when St. Paul's cathedral was damaged by fire, Grindal, then bishop of London, contributed largely to its restoration.¹

The puritans were numerous in the university of Cambridge, and a person of the name of Thomas Cartwright became divinity lecturer there, and rendered himself conspicuous by violent attacks upon the government of the Church during his lectures to the students; disturbances took place, and he was in consequence deprived of his professorship. Many adopted his opinions, and as their objections were no longer confined to the use of the surplice and ceremonies of trifling import, the breach became wider, to the satisfaction of the Church of Rome and the sorrow of those who desired peace and good will among brethren.²

Archbishop Grindal was succeeded in the see of Canterbury by John Whitgift, a learned and excellent prelate, who was born in 1530, and whose father, a rich merchant at Great Grimsby, in Lincolnshire, resolved to give his son a learned education. Whitgift was not ordained till 1560, when his religious opinions, which had long inclined to the reformed doctrines, were decided. In 1573 he became dean of Lincoln, and his fame extending to the court, he became one of the queen's chaplains, and in 1576 bishop of Worcester. Elizabeth had great confidence in Whitgift's wisdom and honesty, and the office of lord chancellor being vacant when he was promoted to the primacy in 1583, her majesty wished him to fill both positions; but he disapproved of holding secular and ecclesiastical offices together, as he perceived that it had led in former times to the neglect of their spiritual duties by the dignitaries of the Church. The Reformation gave to the crown much power over the Church lands, and the queen had not been slow to avail herself of it. Her favourite, the earl of Leicester, endeavoured to obtain considerable grants; and on one occasion, when he had been pressing the queen to bestow some favour upon him, which was very prejudicial to the interests of the Church, Whitgift spoke very strongly both in presence of the earl and afterwards to her majesty. In a letter which he addressed to Elizabeth he said, "I beseech your majesty to hear me with patience, and to believe that yours and the Church's safety are dearer to me than life; but give me leave to do my duty and tell you that princes are deputed nursing-fathers of the Church, and owe it a protection. Consider that king Edgar and Edward the Confessor, and others of your predecessors, and many private Christians, have given to God and his Church much land, and many immunities, which they might have given to their families, and did not, but gave them for ever as an absolute right and sacrifice to God, and with those lands and immunities they have entailed a curse upon the alienation of them. God prevent your majesty and

¹ Dean Hook's *Lives of the Archbishops*, vol. v., new series, *Life of Grindal*.
Also Collier, vol. vi., p. 567.

² Collier, vol. vi., p. 481.

your successors from being liable to that curse. . . . They that consult Magna Charta shall find that, as all your predecessors were at their coronation, so you also were sworn before the nobility and bishops, and in the presence of God, 'to maintain the church lands and the rights belonging to it;' and, therefore, good madam, let God and his Church have their inheritance, and I beg posterity to take notice of what has become visible in many families; that church lands added to an ancient and just inheritance hath proved like a moth fretting a garment, and secretly consumed both. Madam, religion is the foundation and cement of human societies; and, as you are entrusted with a great power to preserve or waste the Church's lands, let neither falsehood nor flattery beguile you, but put a stop to the invasion of God's and the Levite's portion, I beseech you, as you expect comfort at the last great day. Pardon this plainness, my most dear sovereign, and let me be still continued in your favour, and the Lord still continue you in his." The exact date of this letter cannot be fixed, but it is supposed to have been written before Whitgift became archbishop. His courage and disinterestedness are strongly displayed, and the queen, who knew how to value honesty of purpose, received his remonstrance kindly.

The severe measures which were occasionally adopted by the government of Elizabeth towards the Romanists were chiefly employed in self-defence. The pope and Philip II. of Spain were resolved to employ strong means to prevent the extinction of Romish influence in England. With these sovereigns originated those seminaries of which the college of Douay was one of the first and most famous, and we have mentioned that the seminary priests of whom we read so much in English history at this time, came from them. It was well known that if an opportunity should occur, a revolution was to be effected in England by the assassination of the queen. It is, therefore, not surprising that the government was alarmed when these seminary priests landed on our shores. Some modern historians have charged Elizabeth's government with extreme severity; but one of our greatest authorities, Mr. Hallam, asserts that any man in Elizabeth's reign might have saved his life by denying the pope's power to depose the queen, and it is remarked by Rapin, "Although some Roman catholics suffered in her reign, yet none were punished except for conspiring against the queen or the state."¹ But the Jesuits and seminary priests were implacable, and the queen was aware of her danger. In addressing her parliament on one occasion, she said, "I know no creature that breatheth whose life standeth hourly in more peril than mine own is."

Under these circumstances, one would have supposed that protestants of all shades of opinions would have rallied round the throne and the reformed Church. But this was not so; the puritans were as bitter as ever, and desired to have everything placed under their domination. Many fierce libels were written against the queen

¹ *Constitutional History*, vol. i., ch. iii., p. 164, 5th edition; *Histoire d'Angleterre*, tom. vi., l. xvii., p. 495; both quoted by dean Hook.

and the primate, which were published by means of a moveable printing press which the libellers carried from place to place. Some of these were written under the title of Martin Mar-prelate, and it is generally supposed that they originated with a young Welshman of the name of Penry. These and other productions raised a spirit of insubordination, which reached the university of Cambridge, where Cartwright became a leader of the puritan party, at which time Whitgift was vice-chancellor of that university. The zeal and assiduity of Cartwright gained him popularity, and his principles found supporters in parliament, to which he intended to present two pamphlets called *An Admonition to Parliament*. The object was the overthrow of episcopacy and of such principles of the Church as did not accord with those of Calvin. Though the pamphlets were not presented to parliament, they were widely circulated through the country and did great mischief. Whitgift was requested by archbishop Parker to reply to these "admonitions," which he did with his usual ability. It is gratifying to observe that in after years Cartwright received many acts of kindness from the archbishop, and his opinions became much modified. On his death-bed he "regretted the unnecessary trouble he had caused in the Church by the schism of which he had been the great fomentor." The writings of Hooker and Bancroft had done much to produce this happy change; and as Fuller wisely says, "Men, when they consult with their gray hairs, begin to abate their violence."¹

The first schism, which took place about 1570, was led by Robert Brown, who had been educated at Cambridge, and had adopted Cartwright's opinions which he even carried to a greater length. He was the first seceder from the Church of England; his disciples were called Brownists, and this is supposed to be the origin of the sect of independents, or congregationalists, as they have of late years called themselves. Brown afterwards returned to the communion of the Church, but he could not heal the schism he had caused.²

There was a party at Cambridge which agreed with Calvin in his doctrines respecting predestination and election; and about 1595, Whitgift appointed a committee to meet him at Lambeth House, when certain articles, called afterwards the Lambeth articles, were drawn up, which asserted some of the most prominent of the Calvinistic positions. A proof is here afforded, if any were needed, that our Church is not Calvinistic in its doctrines, as this committee thought it necessary to invent new ones in order to make it so. Whitgift's conduct on this occasion showed a want of firmness and judgment, which may be accounted for by his advancing age and infirmities. These articles were disapproved and never went beyond this conference.³

The death of Knox forms an important date in the history of the

¹ Dean Hook's *Lives of the Archbishops*, vol. v., new series, *Life of Whitgift*.

² Collier, vol. vii., p. 1.

³ Dean Hook, *Life of Whitgift*, p. 158.

Scottish Church. He had stamped the character of his powerful mind on its transactions. The avarice of the earl of Morton, who became regent in 1573, was very injurious to the cause of religion. The fear of popery was increased in Scotland by the proceedings of the council of Trent and the massacre of St. Bartholomew; but the imperfect episcopal form of church government which had been established before the death of Knox might have been rendered more acceptable to the community, though the more rigid among the preachers disliked the title of bishop, and the regent, Morton, had it in his power to have brought union and harmony into the state, had not his avaricious spirit produced a contrary effect. He induced the clergy to give up their right to the stipends which parliament had secured to them, on pretence of making them payable in a more convenient way, and he afterwards invented excuses for appropriating a large portion to his own use. He threw several parishes into one, which he placed under the care of a single minister, giving only a small allowance for the increased duty, and he treated the superintendents with harshness and contempt.

In the year 1574, the celebrated Andrew Melville returned from Geneva to Scotland; he entertained the views of Calvin and Beza, but his prejudices against episcopacy were not at first known, and his learning recommended him to the heads of the Church. The general assembly which met at Edinburgh in 1575 is remarkable as being the first in which objections were made to the lawfulness of episcopacy. This discussion occurred when Andrew Melville first appeared as a leading member of the assembly, and it is supposed that he caused the question to be raised. In 1576 he found himself at the head of a party sufficiently strong to prosecute an attack on episcopacy, and he renewed the assault in every successive assembly, till the system which had been established in 1572 was overthrown.¹ The regent had taken offence at some act of discipline enforced by one of the bishops, and encouraged the general assembly to consider a change in church government. A committee was appointed which included Melville, and a scheme was prepared which is known as the *Second Book of Discipline*, but the party were not yet strong enough to carry out their views. In 1578 the young king took the cares of government upon himself.

An assembly was held soon afterwards, of which Melville was chosen moderator, and their proceedings showed a determination to act with or without the concurrence of the government, avowing the principle that in all things which concerned the Church they were quite independent of the sovereign. It was resolved that no bishop should be elected before the meeting of the next assembly, and the several diocesan chapters were accordingly forbidden to take any step towards the choice of a bishop. The assembly also objected to the religious principles of some of the persons who enjoyed the king's confidence, one of whom was chancellor of the realm. The assembly insisted that these persons should

¹ Grub, vol. ii., p. 193—195.

be compelled to subscribe the articles of the reformed kirk. Neither their proceedings nor their book of discipline, however, received the consent of the king or the parliament, and his majesty entreated them to lay aside their attacks on the government of the Church, assuring them that he should soon call the estates together, when the matter would be considered by able and learned persons. The members of the assembly, indisposed to listen to this moderate request, renewed the commission which had been formerly appointed to prosecute the archbishop of St. Andrew's for exercising some part of the episcopal office without permission from the assembly. The king's government was weak; and, as the prejudices of the people now went with the ministers, the power of the presbyterians increased. The preachers did not fear a collision with the king and his ministers while they could count on the assistance of the multitude, so they resolved to demolish episcopacy with a strong hand, and to establish their own discipline upon its ruins. In an assembly held at Dundee in July, 1580, it was enacted that episcopacy should be abolished, and the bishops were required to give up their office as not being called to it by God, it having been "brought in by the folly and corruption of man's invention."¹

Thus, eight years after the death of Knox, notwithstanding the objections raised by the young king and his council, a revolution was again made in the government of the Church, and Melville and his friends succeeded in establishing the presbyterian form as far as the general assembly could do so. Such a proceeding would have been regarded as rebellion under a vigorous government; but in the divided state of the kingdom these clergy feared no such consequence, and they pronounced their decisions with as little restraint as if the civil power had ceased to exist. Among those in the assembly who opposed their scheme was Erskine of Dun, a moderate and enlightened reformer, and one of the superintendents of the kirk; he told Melville that such violent measures as had been adopted at Dundee would prove the bane of the Scottish Church. Similar sentiments were expressed by Spotswood and others; and, in fact, the country was still unsettled as to the form of church government. While those headed by Andrew Melville would be satisfied with nothing short of presbyterianism, there were some who were contented with a modified episcopacy; but the noisy and violent party were successful.

In 1587 the king, when he found that all his efforts to save the life of his mother had failed, requested the ministers to remember her in their public prayers "that it might please God to illuminate her with the light of his truth, and save her from the danger wherein she was cast." With this pious request they, with only one exception, refused to comply. The king, much irritated at such conduct, appointed a special day, and desired the archbishop of St. Andrew's to officiate, but Cowper, one of the preachers, occupied the pulpit before he appeared. Being required to descend, he uttered reproaches,

¹ Russell's *History of the Church in Scotland*, vol. i., ch. ix.

and denounced a woe on the inhabitants of Edinburgh for the sympathy they had shown. The archbishop preached an eloquent sermon on the duty of praying for all men, and the people blamed the violence of their ministers. "They grieved sore," says Spotswood, "to see their teachers so far overtaken, and condemned their obstinacy in that point."¹

We cannot enter into all the disputes that passed, and the pressure to which the king's inclinations were subjected, during these ecclesiastical disputes. At one time he was made a prisoner by his turbulent nobles. It is sufficient to say that in 1592 the presbyterian form and the *Second Book of Discipline* were ratified by parliament and the king. Thirty-two years had passed since the *First Book of Discipline* had been brought forward. The return of Melville in 1574 marks the date at which the presbyterian party formed the intention of changing the government of the Church. Knox had consented to a modified episcopacy, and the fact that he sent his two sons to England for their education shows that he had no serious objection to the system of the English Church as a whole; and while the superintendent scheme was continued in Scotland, the two kingdoms seemed to be portions of the same reformed Church. But when the puritans in England were supported by the sympathy of a powerful party in the Scottish Church, the difference became evident. Penry found a refuge, and was treated with respect in Scotland, though his connection with the mar-prelate libels was notorious.² The long struggle with popery, and the circumstance that it was the faith of the court under Mary and her mother, gave the people an increasing dislike to everything which resembled the Romish Church. The Reformation gave a marked encouragement to learning throughout the two kingdoms; the understanding was appealed to, and schools were established where the people might be made acquainted with the principles of their religious belief. The Scotch were not behind-hand in this; the young people were required to learn the commandments, the articles of the belief, "and other such points," says Spotswood, "as without the knowledge of them, they neither deserve to be called Christians nor ought to be admitted to the Lord's table."³ Secular learning has not been neglected by our Scotch neighbours, but they have not hitherto allowed it to exclude religious instruction. The first edition of the Bible published in Scotland was in 1579, when all those possessed of a certain income were required to procure a copy of it for the use of their families, together with a psalm book in their native tongue.

About 1593 some of the Romanist nobles in Scotland resolved to make an effort on behalf of their own communion, and were detected in a correspondence with Philip II. of Spain. This naturally renewed the angry feelings of their opponents, and as the presby-

¹ Calderwood, p. 214. Spotswood, p. 354. Row MS. Hist., p. 36, quoted in Russell, vol. ii., p. 24.

² Grub, vol. iii., p. 258.

³ Spotswood, p. 160, quoted by Russell, vol. ii., p. 41.

terian clergy conceived that the measures taken were not sufficiently severe, some of them met at Falkland, whence they dispatched four of their number to the king, who told them that their meeting without any warrant from the crown was illegal; upon which, Andrew Melville spoke in the following terms: "I must tell you, sir, that there are two kings and two kingdoms. There is Christ and his kingdom, the kirk; whose subject king James VI. is, and of whose kingdom he is not a king nor a head, but a member; and they whom Christ hath called to watch over his kirk and govern his spiritual kingdom have authority and power so to do, which no Christian king should control." In this address by the founder of Scottish presbyterianism, Andrew Melville used the same reasons for exalting the power of the kirk and diminishing the prerogative of the sovereign which had been urged by Romanists to maintain the supremacy of the pope. The latter claimed it as representing the divine head of the Church; Melville claimed it for himself and his colleagues as representing the kirk, which was the kingdom of Christ, and avowed that their allegiance to the king must depend on his submission to their injunctions. Riots took place in Edinburgh fomented by the violent language used by the presbyterian leaders, but the wiser and more moderate ministers did not approve of this conduct. Politics were largely mixed with the proceedings of the Scotch Reformation; its principles and its leaders evinced a resistance to authority which amounted to lawlessness, and it was truly said "that of all men none could worse endure equality and loved more to command than they who had introduced equality into the kirk."¹

The state of Ireland during the Reformation period was very different to that of England. The tendency to take the opposite side in all England's quarrels disposed the natives of Ireland to retain the supremacy of the pope, forgetful that it was through English influence and conquest that papal influence had been introduced. Thus there was a vital difference between the two countries. In England the national spirit was on the side of the Reformation. In Ireland it was the reverse. Elizabeth disliked persecution, and wished to protect the Irish owners in the possession of their estates; but the best and only hope for the country was the extension of English influence, and it is probable that if the monastic property which had been appropriated to the crown had been employed in settling colonists of the reformed faith throughout the pale, they would have strengthened that influence, supported the reformed clergy, and reconciled the Irish to the changes contemplated. The queen pursued a course which proved disastrous. The act of uniformity and the act of supremacy were passed, and it was hoped, by moderation and forbearance, that the reformed doctrines would advance beyond the pale to the rest of the island; but the church lands were farmed out, the livings were impoverished, and the archbishop of Canterbury, in a letter to secretary

¹ Russell, vol. ii., ch. x.; also xi., p. 42—57.

Cecil, complained of the great want of preachers, and stated that the disloyalty of the people was occasioned, in a great measure, by ignorance; that the greatest number of benefices being framed out by the crown to such as had no care of the parish, religion suffered greatly, and that it was desirable her majesty should give up some part of the impropriations for the maintenance of the ministry who were in a very miserable condition.¹

An order had been made in the reign of Edward VI. that the Holy Scriptures should be placed in all the churches, but their use was directed to be in the English, not in the Irish tongue. Though the English language was not generally spoken by the people, no copy of the New Testament was printed in Irish till 1603, nor of the Common Prayer till 1608; and it was not till 1686 that the Old Testament was translated and printed. Thus, from various causes, England lost the glorious opportunity of repairing the evil she had done to Ireland by introducing Romish doctrines in the twelfth century.²

The Church of Rome took measures to prevent Ireland slipping from her rule. The Jesuits were there, as in England, her faithful servants, though their mission was somewhat different. They stirred up the old feelings of prejudice and national dislike, even going back to the arrival of the Norman lords. They told the people that they were not bound to obey queen Elizabeth, as she was excommunicated, and therefore, unworthy of obedience, and her acts were not lawful. Philip of Spain was preparing for an invasion of England, and it was the policy of both him and the pope to injure this country by influencing Ireland. The result of their intrigues soon appeared; hatred to England as an oppressor; hatred to the reformed Church as connected with her spread and increase; and amongst an ignorant and excitable people these feelings were soon followed up by insurrections and rebellions. The king of Spain assisted the cause with men, money, and arms, and pope Pius promised a plenary indulgence of all their sins to those who joined the rebel chiefs.

The difficulties which the English government had to encounter in Ireland were therefore great. The pope consecrated bishops to sees which were already filled, and these intruders did their best to draw the people away from the reformed clergy. The Reformation had not introduced a new Church, but it purified and restored it to what it had been in former times. The bishops of the present reformed Irish Church are the true successors of St. Patrick, and those of the present Romish episcopate are successors of the bishops who were intruded by the papacy into Ireland from Spain and Italy.³

¹ *The English in Ireland*, by J. A. Froude, M.A., vol. i., p. 47—49. Collier, vol. vi., p. 491.

² *Life of Archbishop Browne*, by Sir J. Ware, p. 154. Also *The Church of Ireland*, by bishop Wordsworth, p. 49.

³ *Key to Church History*, edited by J. H. Blunt, p. 50. Also *The Church of Ireland*, by bishop Wordsworth, p. 48—51.

The insurrection under the earl of Desmond obliged the queen to assert her authority by force of arms, and a fearful struggle ensued; the rebellion was beaten down, and Munster was partially colonized, but in an irregular and imperfect manner. But a more formidable rebellion was afterwards headed by Hugh O'Neill, earl of Tyrone. This nobleman had been indebted to the queen for life and fortune. His father had been murdered, and had he not been sent to England he would have shared his father's fate. At Elizabeth's court no pains were spared to fit him for his future position; it was hoped that he would reclaim his country; he was brought up in the principles of the reformed Church, and when of age received the earldom and returned to Ireland. He had bound himself to support and encourage the reformed religion, but he became himself a Romanist. He had promised to introduce English law, to abolish the Irish customs, and to conform to English rule and order. He assumed the title of 'the O'Neill' as the sign of independent sovereignty, and he adopted the customs he had sworn to discourage. Elizabeth found that the education he had received, and the rank and estates to which he had been restored, only enabled him the better to defy her. We cannot enter into the varying scenes which now took place in Ireland. O'Neill was skilful as a commander and as a politician, and he held the Irish together more than any previous leader had done. When the energies of the rebels were failing, a nuncio was sent from Rome to encourage them, and to assure them that no catholic could without sin submit a heretic sovereign. This doctrine, which worked so many woes for this unhappy country, made toleration impossible. But O'Neill's insurrection was spent. The country was fearfully wasted. The nuncio was killed in a skirmish, and, at the end of 1602, the last rebel laid down his arms. The sufferings occasioned by the war were so terrible that no further punishment was inflicted. The chiefs submitted, O'Neill retained his earldom, and such lands as had fallen to the crown from outlawed leaders killed in battle were bestowed on those of the Irish who had assisted the royal authority.

The worst evil of insurrections is that their suppression in blood leaves behind them hatred which centuries do not efface. The battle had been fought, and England had proved her strength; it was decided to try lenient measures, and it was hoped that Ireland would gradually become reconciled to English ways.¹

We have little to relate about the Reformation in Wales. The people were said to be strong Romanists and very ignorant. In 1563 it was directed that the Old and New Testament and the Book of Common Prayer should be translated into the Welsh language. The work was put into the hands of the bishops of Hereford, St. David's, St. Asaph, Bangor, and Llandaff, who were to inspect the translation, and take care to have a sufficient number printed to supply every parish, where Welsh was com-

¹ Froude's *English in Ireland*, vol. i., p. 55—65.

monly spoken, within their respective dioceses.¹ This was to be completed by 1566; but the New Testament only was published in 1567, and William Salesbury, a native of Denbighshire, who lived in London, deserves mention as having assisted doctor Richard Davies, bishop of St. David's, in the translation. Dr. Davies was also a native of Denbighshire, and had fled from the country during the reign of Mary, but returned on the accession of Elizabeth. He was then made bishop of St. Asaph, and afterwards of St. David's, and was a good and learned man. His piety and zeal were displayed in an address to his countrymen, which was prefixed to this edition of the New Testament. It is said that the Lord's prayer, ten commandments, and creed had been previously translated and published by Sir John Prys.

The whole Bible was translated into Welsh for the first time by doctor William Morgan when rector of a parish in Denbighshire. This excellent man was a native of Carnarvonshire, and educated at Cambridge; and it was through the assistance of Whitgift, archbishop of Canterbury, and others that he was enabled to publish his work in 1588. In his dedication to the queen, doctor Morgan says that a Welsh translation of the Bible was to have been completed by the year 1566, and the non-fulfilment of this duty betrayed idleness and sloth. It appears, however, that this neglect may be accounted for in another way. There was a desire to introduce the English language into the country, and this had produced an indifference to the task of a Welsh translation of the Scriptures; but however desirable the knowledge of the English language might have been, this was not the right way to promote it. The denial of the Scriptures to a people in their own tongue can never be justified. Dr. Morgan gratefully acknowledged the help he had received from archbishop Whitgift, also the kindness of the dean of Westminster, and he mentioned his assistants in the work—David Powell, D.D., Edmund Prys, archdeacon of Merioneth, and Richard Vaughan, rector of Lutterworth, afterwards bishop of Bangor. Dr. Morgan was made bishop of Llandaff in 1595, and afterwards of St. Asaph, where he died in 1604. Archdeacon Prys translated the book of Psalms into verse, which was for a long time used in the Welsh churches.²

Naval enterprise was distinguished in the reign of Elizabeth by the exploits of Sir Francis Drake. In 1570 he cruised in the West Indies, and brought home rich prizes, and in 1579 returned to England after an absence of two years, having sailed round the world. Sir Walter Raleigh fitted out an expedition chiefly at his own expense, to the North American coast, and on its return he gave the tract of country which had been discovered the name of Virginia, in honour of queen Elizabeth. In 1584 the first settlers went there, but the attempts to colonize the territory were at first unfor-

¹ Collier, vol. vi., p. 367.

² *Memoir of the Rev. D. Rowlands, vicar of Llangetho*, by the Rev. John Owen, curate of Thrussington, Leicestershire.

tunate. During the next century British settlements in North America succeeded each other rapidly, and were the foundation of that vast republic now known as the United States.

In 1598 Elizabeth's great enemy, Philip II., died. At his accession he was the richest and most powerful monarch in Europe, and was served by able admirals and generals. At his death his exchequer was empty, Holland was freed from his yoke, the Netherlands were ruined by the war of persecution which had been carried on under Philip's direction, and the only thing which had increased and flourished under his sway was the dreaded Inquisition.

Elizabeth had commenced her reign with an empty exchequer, and neither her army nor her navy was fitted to protect the kingdom; but at this time the country was prosperous, and industry and commerce flourished. The persecuted subjects of the French and Spanish kings had brought to our country the trade and valuable manufactures for which they had been distinguished. There was scarcely a town of any importance in which these artisans had not settled and diligently pursued their several callings. It was not till after the settlement of the Flemish weavers that our cloth manufacture became one of national importance, the native population gradually learning this branch of industry. The Flemish and French refugees introduced also lace-making, pottery work, and the manufacture of Dutch clocks. The Flemings were remarkable for their skill in working in iron and steel, and the instruction they gave to their English apprentices at Sheffield caused that town to acquire the reputation for its productions which it retains to this day. The queen encouraged these foreign artisans, and England not only gave them an asylum and a home, but places of worship where they were permitted to exercise their religion according to the rites of their own churches. A highly interesting memorial of their settlement is the French or Flemish church in our ancient cathedral of Canterbury. That learned and Christian-hearted prelate, archbishop Parker, granted to the exiles, with the sanction of the queen, the free use of the under-croft or crypt of the cathedral, where they celebrated their worship and taught their children. Texts of Scripture are still to be seen written in old French over some of the columns in the crypt. The visitor to the cathedral may see this old Flemish church, where the worship still continues, and where psalms are sung to the old Huguenot tunes.¹ Three hundred years have passed and gone—one generation has succeeded another—since the exiles met on that spot; still this memorial remains, bearing testimony to the Christian spirit of the English Church, and showing that our country then, as now, was the free and peaceful asylum of sufferers from religious or political tyranny.

Elizabeth's long and glorious reign was now drawing to a close. She had entered the seventieth year of her age and the forty-fifth of her reign at the time of her death. On the evening of March 23rd, 1603, the archbishop of Canterbury was summoned to her bed-

¹ *The Huguenots*, by Smiles, ch. v. and vi.

side. He kneeled down and prayed earnestly, reminding her that she had long been a great queen on earth, but that she was now to yield an account of her stewardship to the King of kings. He then used the visitation service for the sick, those around joining in the responses. On the following morning the great bell of St. Paul's announced to the people that the queen was no more.¹

Like all the sovereigns of the house of Tudor, Elizabeth was arbitrary and self-willed; but her prudence and good sense kept these feelings under control, and enabled her, with the assistance of the wise counsellors whom she selected, and in whom she placed entire confidence, to surmount the difficulties which surrounded her. She possessed great courage and abilities, and knew how to engage the affections of her people without losing dignity or authority. She spoke Latin, French, and Italian, and understood Spanish and Greek; she was possessed of much musical taste, and employed her leisure hours in literature. Elizabeth was careful in applying to parliament for money, lest the members should take advantage thereof and interfere with her proceedings; but the means she adopted to obtain funds from other sources were often very unjustifiable. She took back the first-fruits, &c., which her sister Mary had returned to the Church, though its poverty in the early part of her reign, not only amongst the higher but amongst the parochial clergy, was excessive. Her dislike to marriage made her somewhat severe on this point to those about her, and she was always adverse to the marriage of the clergy.²

The Reformation had taught persons to think for themselves, and as the mass of the people began to be enlightened, so did they become observant of the proceedings of their rulers and desirous of influencing public affairs. In Elizabeth's reign they found a government ready to promote their good, and able to check undue interference. The queen's supremacy was attacked by two descriptions of her subjects—the Romanists and the puritans. In the early part of her reign forbearance was shown to both; the exemplary lives led by the first generation of puritans, and the sufferings which had been undergone by those who came from foreign countries, caused their objections to the vestments and ceremonies of the Church to be tolerated. It is impossible to say if their feelings of discontent would have lessened had the queen and her counsellors shown the same moderation throughout; but it is certain that before the close of her reign a race of puritans had arisen whose object was to set up that discipline which Calvin had instituted at Geneva, and whose feelings were hostile to the reformed Church of England. We shall presently see that their opposition to the state became closely connected with their religious scruples.³

¹ Dean Hook's *Lives of the Archbishops*, vol. v., new series, p. 171.

² Collier, vol. vii., p. 225. Bishop Short, p. 312.

³ Bishop Short, p. 368. Southey, p. 412.

CHAPTER XXVI.

CENTURY XVII.

JAMES I. HAMPTON COURT CONFERENCE. DEATH OF JAMES, 1625.

ELIZABETH was succeeded by the son of her rival Mary, who took the title of James I. The hopes of the puritans were raised, as the new sovereign had been brought up amongst that party in Scotland whose views in many ways coincided with their own; but James had suffered so much discomfort and received so many insults from Andrew Melville and his followers, that their principles had left a most unfavourable impression on his mind. His new position formed a strong contrast to the turmoil and violence which had beset his path from early life. Before entering upon church affairs it may be well to make a few remarks upon those which concern the state, the more so as the condition of the one bore closely upon that of the other.

We have said that in the civil wars of the roses the ancient barons of England were almost extinguished; the Reformation had lessened the number of ecclesiastical lords and the power of those which remained. The new nobility which had been created from time to time had neither the dignity nor the pride of the old feudal barons, and there was no army to take the place of the vassals or retainers of those barons, who during the feudal ages had been ever ready to follow their lord to the field of battle. The influence of the crown was greatly increased during the strong government of the Tudor sovereigns, and in every department it had obtained powers unknown in earlier times. In taxation the parliament alone could grant those payments of money which were called subsidies; but the crown had other means of raising funds, such as customs duties, which were granted to the sovereign by parliament, under the name of tonnage and poundage, at the beginning of every reign, and some small payments called impositions, which Mary and Elizabeth had demanded without any parliamentary grant. There were also loans, which were sometimes paid voluntarily and sometimes demanded; but Elizabeth was more careful to avoid irregular demands of money than her father or grandfather had been. The crown had encroached on the nation in other matters. Its struggle against the nobles and its struggle against the papacy had each left its mark on the judicial system, by a court which judged without a jury. The first produced the court of star chamber; the second produced the court of high commission.

The court of star chamber in Elizabeth's time was composed of the whole of the privy council and the two chief justices. Its right to judge was founded partly on old claims of the privy council, partly on an act of parliament made in the early part of the reign

of Henry VII. It could not take away life, but it could fine and imprison, and in case of libels and offences of the like kind it could place a man in the pillory and sentence him to lose his ears. It may have been useful when first established in punishing rich and powerful offenders, whom juries would have been afraid to convict, but a court which was so completely under the influence of the crown might easily be used against the nation which it was meant to serve.

The court of high commission was a kind of ecclesiastical star chamber, founded by Elizabeth; we have named it in a previous chapter. It was composed of clergy and laymen appointed by the queen, and was able to fine and imprison, as well as to degrade and suspend clergymen from their functions. Here, as in the star chamber, much depended on the way in which the court exercised its powers.

During the sixteenth century, therefore, the changes in the constitution had been in favour of the crown. Royalty had come to be regarded as the protector of national rights against the nobility at home, and the pope and his allies abroad. With all Elizabeth's faults she sympathized with the people whom she ruled. For Elizabeth's successor the difficulties were greater, and the house of commons was growing conscious of its strength. James was descended in a direct line from Henry VII., but he had not grown up in England nor been accustomed to English ways of thinking. His mental powers were not inconsiderable, but he disliked trouble, and was impatient of opposition, and his Scotch experience of puritanism had not been such as to enlist his sympathies towards it; he was not likely to forget the day when Andrew Melville had plucked him by the sleeve, and had addressed him as "God's silly vassal."¹ But the power of the puritans was increasing in England, and James's high ideas of sovereignty were not aided by dignity of person or manner.

When the congratulations of the archbishops and bishops were conveyed to him, he stated in his reply that he would uphold the Church in England as it was left by the queen. The puritans presented a petition, which was called the millenary petition, from its professing that it was signed by more than one thousand persons, though it was not signed by more than seven hundred and fifty. Their most important demands and causes of complaint were divided under four heads, of which we give the principal points.

I. In the church service:—Objections were made to the sign of the cross in baptism, the use of the ring in marriage, the terms 'priest' and 'absolution;' also to the length of the service, confirmation, and the use of the surplice; while they required that the Lord's day should not be profaned, that uniformity of doctrine be prescribed, that no popish opinions be taught or defended, and that the ministers should not teach their people to bow at the name of Jesus.

¹ *The First two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution*, by Gardiner, ch. i., sections i. and ii.; and see Russell's *Scotland*, vol. ii., p. 55.

II. Concerning church ministers:—None were to be admitted but able men, who should be required to preach diligently; such as could not preach to be removed and provided for charitably, or else be forced to maintain a preacher; non-residence not to be permitted.

III. Church living and maintenance:—Various suggestions were made on this head respecting payments of bishops and ministers, and objections raised to plurality of benefices. It was suggested that the greater part of ecclesiastical impropriations, and a sixth or seventh of all lay ones, be restored to the parochial clergy.

IV. Church discipline:—Discipline and excommunication were to be administered according to Christ's institution; enormities to be redressed, but men were not to be excommunicated for trifles, or without consent of their pastor.

The heads of the Church much wished to see an amendment regarding pluralities, discipline and payments; but the views of the two parties as to the means of carrying these out did not probably coincide. The governors of the Church saw difficulties which the other party did not take into due consideration. The puritans had wished for a public conference in the last reign, but the queen would not consent to it. King James was of a different opinion, and certain delegates from each party were summoned to attend his majesty at Hampton Court.

The king was fully aware of the difficulties, and requested archbishop Whitgift to gain all necessary information from the bishops as to the condition of their dioceses. He also wished for information with regard to the Common Prayer, and though favourably inclined to the Church of England, was anxious to arrive at the truth, by hearing what might be advanced against it.¹ At the head of the advocates of the Church at the conference were Whitgift, archbishop of Canterbury, Bancroft, bishop of London, and other bishops and divines. The representatives of the puritan party consisted of doctor John Reynolds, doctor Sparks, and others. Doctor Reynolds, who was a learned and pious man, was president of Corpus Christi college, Oxford.

The king made a short speech, and after commending the advocates of the puritans for their modesty and learning, stated that he was ready to hear their objections. With regard to the use of the cross, Dr. Reynolds acknowledged that the cross had been used ever since the apostles' time, but the question was how ancient the use of it had been in baptism. Upon this the learned Andrewes, then dean of Westminster, proved the antiquity of such use of it from the writings of Origen and Cyprian, who lived within two hundred years of our Saviour's death. Dr. Reynolds still objected, and instanced the brazen serpent which Hezekiah destroyed, because it had been an object of idolatry, so he considered the use of the cross should be checked, because it had been carried to a superstitious excess in the times of popery. It was said in reply that we retain those things which were used in primitive times, and do not

¹ Collier, vol. vii., p. 268—271. Bishop Short, p. 844.

give them up because they have been since put to an ill use, as giving up doctrines or ceremonies for that reason would lead us very far from the primitive Church and the customs of apostolic times.

The use of the surplice was justified for the same reasons, it being evident from antiquity that the clergy officiated at divine service in a different habit to their usual dress, and particularly in white linen. As to confirmation the archbishop proved its antiquity, and Bancroft, bishop of London, showed that it had for its support the practice of the primitive Church and the testimony of the fathers; that it was mentioned in the New Testament (Heb. vi. 2), and that Calvin expounded that text in this sense, and wished the custom to be revived in those reformed churches which had dropped it. With regard to absolution, the archbishop cleared the Church of England from all abuse and superstition, appealing to the confession and absolution in the beginning of the Prayer Book; and the bishop of London, referring to that more particular and personal one in the visitation of the sick, stated that the German reformed communion retained it. The king said, "I look upon it as an apostolical and godly ordinance given in Christ's name to one that desireth it upon the clearing of his conscience."

Dr. Reynolds expressed a desire that the Lambeth articles should be generally received. It will be remembered that these articles had been suggested at a meeting of prelates and divines at Lambeth in 1594, and that they strongly asserted the doctrines of Calvin as to predestination. Some discussion followed on points connected with these doctrines. Dr. Reynolds objected to the words in the marriage service, "with my body I thee worship," but it was shown that it meant no more than the usual English term (now obsolete) a 'gentleman of worship,' and agreed with the Scriptures, giving honour unto the wife. The king said, "As for you, Dr. Reynolds, if you had a good wife yourself, you would think all the worship and honour you could do her well bestowed upon her." The ring in marriage was approved by Reynolds, whose next request was for a new translation of the Bible, as the present version did not come up to the meaning of the original. This was agreed to, and the method suggested by the king was afterwards adopted. With regard to the three articles which the clergy were required to subscribe, that is, the royal supremacy, the Book of Common Prayer, and the thirty-nine articles, the king urged that since the bishops had to answer for every clergyman in their dioceses, it was reasonable they should know their sentiments. The king on one occasion during the conference said, "I know of no way of avoiding the charge of novelty attributed to us by the Papists, but by answering that we retain the primitive use of things, and only stand off from the innovations which the Romanists have brought in." He added, he had a strong aversion to disapproving everything used by the Romanists, which might lead men to renounce many important points of faith because they are common to them and the reformers.

The result of this conference was a slight alteration in some

of the rubrics, and the addition of some of the thanksgiving prayers to be used after the litany. All the questions and answers relating to the sacraments were also added to the catechism. Dr. Reynolds and the other puritan representatives seemed satisfied with the result, and promised to regard the bishops as their spiritual fathers, but the puritan party were dissatisfied, and complained that the ministers had argued as if the ceremonies to which they objected were not sinful but only distasteful.¹

The conference, however, was not useless, and its most important result was the new translation of the Bible. Great pains were taken to secure the services of the most experienced Greek and Hebrew scholars for this work, and it was entrusted to forty-seven of the most learned men in the kingdom. The Scriptures were divided into six portions, and the translators into six divisions; a separate portion of Scripture being assigned to each division. In case of a difference of opinion, the dispute was to be referred to a committee, consisting of the ablest men of each division. Lastly, the whole translation was to be laid before them, or four of the most eminent divines in each of the universities (not being translators), to be selected by the vice-chancellors, and they were to consult with the other heads of houses in reviewing the whole work.

Dr. Reynolds, who had moved for the translation, was selected together with one of his companions at the conference, to assist in the work, but died soon after commencing it. He was born in Devonshire and brought up at Oxford. He conformed to the Church, and on his death-bed desired absolution in the form prescribed, receiving it with much feeling.

The translators commenced their work in 1607, but it was not completed for three years, nor printed before 1611. The result of their care and diligence has been a translation which has largely contributed to the maintenance of sound religion amongst us.² The following remarks on this English version of the Bible are from the pen of a distinguished member of our Church, after he had left her for that of Rome, and is an eloquent tribute to its excellence:—"It lives in the ear like a music that can never be forgotten, like the sound of church bells which the convert hardly knows how he can forego. It is part of the national mind and the anchor of national seriousness. The power of all the griefs and trials of a man is hidden beneath its words. It is the representative of his best moments. . . . In the length and breadth of the land there is not a protestant with one spark of religiousness about him whose spiritual biography is not in his Saxon Bible." And doctor Cumming, a Scotch divine, says, "The words of our English version have been wrought into the very substance of our speech, our thoughts, and our household terms. They ring like sweet chimes in our hymns, our prayers, our best sermons." Let us hope that the words of these two writers may prove equally applicable

¹ Berens, p. 84—97. Collier, vol. vii., p. 267—298.

² Berens, p. 99.

to future generations of Englishmen, and that the time may never come when instruction in our Bible is neglected in the education of the young.

Shortly after the conclusion of the Hampton Court conference, archbishop Whitgift was seized with illness, and died on the last day of February, 1604. His last words were, "Pro Ecclesiâ Dei." He was buried at Croydon, and "thus this good man," says a contemporary writer of puritan views, "expired in David's fulness of days, leaving a name like sweet perfume behind him." Whitgift was a devoted father of the Church of England, straightforward and resolute in his principles, noble in his charities, with learning and temper suitable to his station. To him queen Elizabeth had looked for counsel and advice, and he survived only twelve months the sovereign whom he served so faithfully.¹

Parliament and convocation assembled in March, and in order to give effect to the decisions of the conference which had been held, the latter was directed to form a new body of canons. They number a hundred and forty-one, and form the basis of ecclesiastical law as far as the clergy are concerned; but as they never passed through parliament, though they received the royal assent, they do not bind the laity. Little is known of the history of their composition, excepting that they chiefly consist of a summary of old canons to which some new ones were added. In parliament the security of the revenues of the Church was guarded by an act making all alienations of church property to the crown illegal.²

Richard Bancroft succeeded Whitgift as archbishop of Canterbury. He had been educated at Cambridge, and soon after his ordination became chaplain to doctor Richard Cox, bishop of Ely. In 1589, he was made a prebendary of St. Paul's, and being a man of deep learning and an eloquent preacher, he obtained much influence, and became bishop of London in 1597. Bancroft saw the dangers which threatened the Church from the puritans, and incurred much unpopularity from that party by his sermons and books, in which he alluded to their insubordination and intemperate language. Equally opposed to the errors of popery, he nevertheless wished that the secular Romish priests, who were content to live quietly as good subjects, should meet with milder treatment than the Jesuits and seminary priests, who were desirous of creating disturbances, and dethroning and even assassinating the queen. If Bancroft's advice had been followed the country would have been saved much trouble, but the two classes were confounded together and treated with the same severity. There was always in this country a body of loyal Romanists, and at the present day a distinction exists between the more moderate of that party and the Ultramontanes. In the Hampton Court conference Whitgift's failing health occasioned the bishop of London to take a leading part, and the millenary petition, as it was called, is of some

¹ Dean Hook, vol. v., new series, p. 184—189.

² Bishop Short, p. 355.

historical value, as it shows to a certain extent the objections then raised against the practices as well as the doctrines of the Church of England. The petitioners, who styled themselves "the ministers of the Church of England that desire reformation," wished for this conference between the puritan and non-puritanical clergy: the pacification of all parties was hoped for, but the result was not encouraging, and it must be admitted that Bancroft showed a warmth of temper and sometimes a want of judgment during the conference.¹

The new archbishop was strict in requiring conformity to the rubrics and laws of the Church. He has been accused of rigour, but it is necessary that men should obey the rules of the community to which they belong, or there would be an end to all discipline. Uniformity in public worship is to a certain extent necessary, but this uniformity was irksome when the dissatisfied members of the congregation were not allowed to withdraw and establish their own worship apart. However, the idea of separate religious bodies, each worshipping as they think right, would have been rejected by all parties in the reign of James I.² The clergy were required to sign the three articles, and though the enforcement of this measure was considered a necessity by most persons at that time, we find it subsequently censured by many sound churchmen. It drove many of the puritans into open non-conformity, and some went into Holland and other places on the continent, where however they were not very cordially received. The measure bore equally on the papists and puritans, and the archbishop's attempt to force discipline upon the Church and nation may have been ill-timed.³ But in many ways the Church improved under his rule; the liturgy came to be more solemnly performed and religious matters in general were better observed.⁴

The Romanists regarded James as the son of Mary, queen of Scots, who had been their rallying point in England, and to whose cause they had adhered; they, therefore, looked for greater toleration at his hands, but they soon found that this would not be the case, and that the nation would relax none of the severities against them. The irritation caused by their disappointment appears to have induced the Gunpowder-plot conspiracy on the 5th November, 1605, whereby it was intended to destroy the king, lords, and commons, when they assembled in parliament. Though this treasonable plot cannot be charged on the Romanists as a body, it was evident that the promotion of their cause was the motive for which it was contrived, and the effects of this diabolical attempt were disastrous to all in England who clung to the Romish com-

¹ Dean Hook, vol. v., p. 190—209. Collier, vol. vii., p. 267.

² Gardiner's *Puritan Revolution*, ch. i., sec. iii.

³ The three articles were "the queen's ecclesiastical supremacy, the unexceptionableness of the Common Prayer and ordinal, and an acknowledgment that the thirty-nine articles are altogether agreeable to the word of God." Collier, vol. vii., b. vii.

⁴ Dean Hook, vol. v., p. 221.

munion. The bills brought into parliament showed the alarmed and exasperated feeling which had been aroused. Romanists were not allowed to come within ten miles of London unless they were exercising a trade in the city. They were disabled from being barristers or attorneys, physicians or apothecaries, and from serving in the army or navy; nor could they be advanced to any employment in the state. They were forbidden to send their children abroad for education, though no Romanist was allowed to teach; and their children could not inherit property till they had taken the oath of allegiance. In short, they were treated as persons who could in no way be trusted. The intention of the government in requiring the oath was wise, and it was so worded that it might be taken by papists so long as they did not consider that the pope might depose sovereigns. Pope Paul V. issued a brief declaring that none could take it without wronging God, but as many seem to have done so, the pope addressed a second brief to them, dated from Rome, August, 1607, enforcing more strongly his prohibition.¹

James wished to bring about a close union between England and Scotland, but the house of commons was so prejudiced as to see all sorts of dangers in his designs. The judges decided that all Scotchmen born after James's accession were naturalized Englishmen. All hope of obtaining any closer union was given up for the present.²

It is sometimes asserted, and it is generally believed, that the restoration of episcopacy in Scotland originated with archbishop Laud; but this is a mistake. James never forgot the treatment he had received from the Scotch presbyterians, and he it was who resolved upon the measure. He, however, shewed more than his usual caution in this matter, and did not employ either of the two English archbishops. The earl of Dunbar was his representative in Scotland, and the English adviser whom he selected was doctor Abbot, whose puritan leanings were strong.³

In 1606 James summoned some of the Scotch clergy of both the episcopal and presbyterian parties to attend him at Hampton Court. The cause of this summons was an assembly which had been convened at Aberdeen without the royal authority, and which continued to sit after the notice to prorogue was sent. The archbishops of St. Andrew's and Glasgow, the bishops of Orkney, Galloway, and Dunkeld represented the episcopal side. The presbyterians were represented by Andrew and James Melville and five others, all of whom were well qualified to support the tenets of Calvin. The interview does not appear to have soothed these discontented spirits, and Andrew Melville's conduct and language was so little under control that he was sent to the Tower, where he remained for three years, after which he was allowed to accept a professorship abroad, where he spent the remainder of his days.

¹ Bishop Short, p. 356—359. Collier, vol. vii., pp. 335, 341.

² Gardiner's *Puritan Revolution*, ch. i., sec. iii.

³ Dean Hook, vol. v., p. 227.

A general assembly was convened at Glasgow in the summer of 1610, in which acts were passed, which placed the Church in Scotland on the basis of regular episcopacy; after which Spotswood, archbishop of Glasgow, and the bishops of Brechin and Galloway came to England, and received episcopal consecration on October 21st, 1610, from Andrewes bishop of Ely, assisted by other English bishops, and thus was the foundation of the episcopal Church again laid. The more courteous manners of the earl of Dunbar and doctor Abbot carried this measure into execution with greater ease than would have been done by Bancroft, as his efforts to establish Church principles were frequently retarded by his impetuosity and irritability of temper. The consecration of the Scottish prelates was needful, as it will be remembered that the episcopal succession had been lost in Scotland during the Reformation. Neither of the English archbishops consecrated the Scotch bishops, lest their brethren in the north might be led to apprehend a revival of the old claim to supremacy on the part of the English Church. When the prelates returned to Scotland, the bishops of the other sees received consecration at their hands.

James I. greatly improved the incomes of the Scotch clergy, and secured moderate endowments for several of the bishoprics by purchasing portions of the alienated church lands with his own money. Happily the old divisions of parishes remained through all the changes which took place in Scotland. The parishes were about one thousand in number, and it was long after the Reformation before each was supplied with a minister of its own.

It has been said by those who were unfavourable to this movement that the members of the assembly at Glasgow were swayed by interested motives in their votes for restoring episcopacy. To enter into such an argument would be beyond the limits of this work, but we may remark that the evils which had attended the want of regularly ordained ministers, and the unseemly contentions which had so long distracted the Scotch Church, together with the absence of Melville and other leading spirits, may account sufficiently for this decision. The violent party were not the most numerous, but experience proves how greatly the public peace may be disturbed by a minority remarkable only for perseverance, and in all national commotions the immense majority who are silent are often overlooked.¹

Two years afterwards a parliament was held in Edinburgh which confirmed the acts of the assembly at Glasgow, and those laws which were contrary to its decisions were annulled. In 1616, the convocation of the Church met at Aberdeen, where it was agreed to prepare a catechism suited for children; and a resolution was passed in favour of the expediency of common prayers, and uniformity in Church discipline; to be secured by suitable canons. The bishops and the episcopal party, remembering the prejudices that had existed, were careful not to act too hastily or disturb the

¹ Grub, vol. ii., p. 203. Russell, vol. ii., ch. xi., p. 77—100.

altered feeling that had arisen; but James's great wish was to see the two countries united under one form of Church discipline and ritual, and he was not gifted with the judgment required under such circumstances. In 1617, the king visited Edinburgh, and directed that the chapel of Holyrood palace should be repaired; some small figures of the apostles had been placed therein, which occasioned great alarm amongst some of the citizens and their favourite preachers, who exclaimed that "images were come, and they should soon have the mass." During a parliament which was held soon after his arrival, his majesty showed some anxiety to establish his prerogative in ecclesiastical matters, but the resolution which was passed respecting it was not satisfactory to either the king or the clergy, and it did not seem desirable to the prelates that attempts to establish their authority by the sovereign should be persevered in, as it might awaken former jealousies. After the king's return to England a convocation of the clergy was held at Perth, when certain canons were adopted which are known as the articles of Perth, and were ratified by parliament in 1621. The following are the heads:—

I. With regard to kneeling at the Holy Communion; as no part of divine worship is more spiritual, so the most reverent and humble position best befits so sacred an action.

II. If any good Christian by reason of sickness be unable to receive the Communion in church, and earnestly desires to receive the same in his house, the minister shall not deny him so great a comfort, so that there be three or four present to communicate with him.

III. That the people shall not defer the baptism of infants, and that they shall be warned not to have them baptized at home, unless there is great need for it, in which case the minister shall, after such private baptism, declare on the next Lord's day that the infant has been so baptized, and may, therefore, be received as one of Christ's flock.

IV. That as a means of staying the increase of popery and settling true religion, special care be taken of young children, their education and catechizing, and that all children shall be instructed in the Lord's prayer, belief, and ten commandments.

V. That as the days of our Saviour's birth, passion, resurrection and ascension, and the sending down of the Holy Ghost, were remembered at certain days and times by the whole Church, so it may still be done, each minister rebuking all superstitious observance and profanation thereof.

Such were the articles of Perth, and they are justified by the customs of the primitive Church. Yet it was asserted by one of the dissatisfied ministers that the conclusions were "superstitious and damnable, and inclined for the most part to idolatry."¹ Unfortunately there was still a party hostile to ancient discipline and

¹ Russell, vol. ii., p. 100—113. Grub, vol. ii., p. 314.

forms, however scriptural, if only they had existed during the period of popish supremacy in Scotland.

The archbishop of Canterbury had been seized with illness soon after the consecration of the Scottish bishops, and died November, 1610. He left his library for the continual use of his successors, which, during the disturbed times of the rebellion, was removed to Cambridge, but restored to Lambeth palace after the restoration, and it was his request that within a month of his death a sermon should be preached at Lambeth church, in which such mention of him should be made as should tend to the glory of God. There could not be found a better illustration of conscientious work in the service of God, and for the well-being of his Church on earth, than the energetic life of Richard Bancroft. In modern times the statements of the puritans respecting him have been repeated by those from whom better things might have been expected. Those who were objects of severity to Bancroft were persons who, having sworn to obey the laws of the Church, objected to adhere to their oath.¹ Clarendon says that he understood the Church well, and had nearly recovered it out of the hands of the Calvinian party; that he disposed the clergy to a solid course of study, and that, had he been succeeded by bishop Andrewes, or any man who understood and loved the Church, that infection would have been kept out which could not afterwards so easily be expelled.²

The great learning and piety of bishop Andrewes of Ely pointed him out as the proper successor to this important position, and his election was pressed by many of the bishops, but James's favourite, the earl of Dunbar, was urgent for the appointment of doctor George Abbot, whom we have previously named. Abbot became dean of Westminster in 1599, and while seeking to win the puritans by preaching Calvinistic doctrines, he advocated the established order of things in the Church, including its episcopacy. While vice-chancellor of Oxford his anger was aroused by finding that his Calvinistic opinions were disputed by a much younger man, William Laud, who eventually succeeded him as primate. Abbot was one of the divines employed in the translation of the Bible after the conference at Hampton Court. In 1608, he became chaplain to the earl of Dunbar, and the prudence of his advice and conduct during the re-introduction of episcopacy into Scotland caused the king to think highly of his abilities. During the time that he was bishop of London, he assisted at the consecration of the Scottish bishops, and after the experience of only fifteen months in the episcopal office, was promoted to the see of Canterbury. His appointment was not a popular one; he had never been a parish priest, and was not much beloved by the clergy. Though a pious man, he was narrow minded, and never seemed to become reconciled to any divine whose views of the existing state of affairs differed from his own. His principles were decidedly

¹ Dean Hook, vol. i., new series, p. 240—242.

² Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*, in one vol., Oxford ed., 1848, b. i., p. 86.

opposed to those of the late archbishop, and his appointment was unfortunate for the Church. Fuller says, "He was mounted to command in the Church before he had learned to obey, and made a shepherd of shepherds before he was a shepherd of sheep, being consecrated bishop before ever called to a parochial charge."¹ Abbot attended the death-bed of Henry prince of Wales, the eldest son of James, who died in 1612.

The marriage of the princess Elizabeth, James's eldest daughter, to Frederick the elector palatine, took place shortly afterwards. The growing discontent of the house of commons took the form of unwillingness to grant sufficient supplies, and James was induced to obtain money from other sources. He added further impositions upon articles imported, some of which were refused by a merchant named Bate. The judges decided that the king had a right to set these impositions, which decision is now considered to have been wrong, but it was of importance at that time, as James could thus raise money without applying to parliament. Though these impositions were obtained, the king still required money, which parliament was not inclined to give, being displeased at the mode in which he had already raised it.²

James proposed to marry his son Charles, now prince of Wales, to the infanta of Spain; but the project was highly unpopular in England, as the people had not forgotten the enmity of Philip II. Spain was the great support of the papacy, and it was very naturally thought that Spanish influence might bear strongly on the religious education of the children of the proposed union. The great thirty-years' war, which lasted from 1618 to 1648, was now causing misery and bloodshed throughout Europe. The elector palatine was invited by the Bohemian states to become their king in opposition to the wishes of the house of Austria. Germany was divided into two parties, the catholic league and the evangelical union—the house of Austria heading the former. It was at first a religious war, and the English people were eager to engage in it on the evangelical side, for they felt much interest in the fortunes of the elector palatine, on account of his religion and his marriage to the English princess. The house of commons, considering the king to be too lukewarm in the matter, took the unprecedented step of preparing a remonstrance in which they urged his majesty to undertake the defence of his son-in-law, and to turn his arms against Spain and Austria. James hesitated, as the negotiations for the Spanish marriage were proceeding; and meanwhile Frederick was driven from Bohemia and the palatinate. The king was most anxious for peace, and summoned parliament to give him supplies, so as to be ready for war should negotiations between the contending parties fail. The commons voted only a small sum, and thoroughly out of humour turned to domestic grievances.

Private persons were allowed by the government to possess the

¹ Dean Hook, vol. v., new series, *Life of Abbot*. Fuller quoted by Berens, p. 104.

² Gardiner's *Puritan Revolution*, ch. i., sec. iv.

right of selling various articles, partly from a wish to encourage home manufactures; and these rights were called monopolies. As the persons who obtained these privileges were frequently friends or dependants of James's favourite, the duke of Buckingham, the custom became unpopular. The traffic in place and power, which was carried on under his protection, also aroused indignation. The commons voted a declaration of sympathy with the German protestants, and wished the king to break entirely with Spain, which he had not yet done. They also urged him to enforce the laws against Romanists in England, and place himself at the head of the protestants on the continent. Eventually, the prince of Wales and the duke of Buckingham became exasperated against Spain, and the Spanish match was broken off.

In 1624, a new parliament was called; James was anxious to regain the palatinate for his daughter and son-in-law, but the warmth of feeling for the German protestants had cooled, now that all fear of an alliance with Spain was at an end, and the commons voted only enough money to strengthen the defences of the kingdom. A marriage was arranged between the prince of Wales and the princess Henrietta Maria, sister of the king of France, and a treaty was signed with that kingdom in which certain concessions were to be made to the English Romanists. The commons did not wish for a Romanist queen, and their objections were natural and reasonable. An alliance was entered into with the French and Dutch, with the view of recovering the palatinate, but money was wanted and disasters occurred.¹

We have said that archbishop Abbot was severe towards those who differed from him, and it is with deep regret and astonishment that we find two persons of anabaptist and Arian principles were burnt to death during his primacy—Bartholomew Legget, who suffered at Smithfield in 1611, and Edward Wightman at Lichfield in the same year. The horror, however, which this severity occasioned, alarmed the king, who declared that death should not again be inflicted for heresy. It is remarkable that Neal, the puritan historian, relates the burning of these poor victims without a word of condemnation,² which is a proof, if any were needed, of the tendency to intolerance amongst those who are most impatient of control.

The king, when he was travelling towards Scotland in 1617, observed the rigour with which the puritan clergy were enforcing the observance of Sunday upon the working-men. The strictness of the presbyterian Sabbath had probably not passed from his memory. The church festivals which had been kept previous to the Reformation had been abolished, and James disapproved of the disposition shown by the puritans to turn the Lord's day into a fast. Contrary to the dictates of policy, and we may add of sound religion, he put forth the *Book of Sports*. In this it was desired to point out Friday as the fast, and Sunday as the feast in each

¹ Gardiner's *Puritan Revolution*, ch. ii. and iii., sec. i.

² Dean Hook, vol. v., *Life of Abbot*, p. 265.

week. It was declared that the games which were allowed should be the reward of those only who had attended divine service, and that those who had been absent from worship should not be permitted to join in the recreations of the day. The archbishop disapproved of this proceeding, and did not permit the proclamation to be read in his church at Croydon. It would appear that the public feeling coincided with Abbot, as the reading of the proclamation ceased to be enforced.¹

The Channel islands were brought into conformity with the Church of England about this time, and were placed under the jurisdiction of a dean, subject to the bishop of Winchester, in whose diocese they were declared to be. These islands, which had formed part of the possessions of the dukes of Normandy, were retained by England, when Normandy itself was lost in the reign of John, and have ever since remained a possession of the English crown. Though speaking the French language, the inhabitants are warmly attached to the connection with this country, and with good reason, as they retain their ancient constitution while enjoying the protection of a great kingdom.²

We have stated that the rebellion in Ireland, under the earl of Tyrone, had been subdued shortly before the death of queen Elizabeth, and that lenient measures had been adopted towards the Irish, and a general pardon granted for every act committed during the rebellion. It was hoped that peace and quietness might be established, but men who have been long accustomed to rapine and sedition are not restrained by the experience of past miseries from returning to their former courses. The earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnell were the leaders of the next insurrectionary movement; they entered into intrigues with other Irish lords and applied to the court of Spain for assistance, but the design was discovered, and the two earls fled to the continent. Their intentions were the more inexcusable, as English law and order were beginning to take root; the principles of the reformed Church were making progress; and, had it not been for papal intrigues and the sedition of the Irish chiefs, the country might have been happy and peaceable. The English government had wished to govern Ireland through chiefs of their own race, but it was now resolved, if possible, to put an end to Irish anarchy. The *Irish proper*, that is, the ancient inhabitants, still led a wild and barbarous life; the chieftains or heads of the septs or clans succeeded each other in an irregular manner and governed their vassals in a very oppressive way; this made the people disinclined to labour, and caused the land to lie waste. The king, in the hope of settling the country in peace and improving the condition of the people, determined that the English laws and privileges which had hitherto been confined to that portion of the country called the Pale should be extended throughout Ireland. The number of judges in the courts of law

¹ Dean Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops—Life of Abbot*, vol. v., p. 273.

² Freeman's *Norman Conquest*, vol. i., p. 186.

was increased: their circuits, which had been discontinued in the southern portion for two hundred years, were revived, and assizes were held twice every year. The kingdom was also divided into counties.

A great part of Ulster had become forfeited to the crown by this last treason of the two earls. The province had suffered exceedingly; great numbers had perished by the sword and still more by famine, and those who were left were reduced to such poverty that they were unable to till the ground; and the soil which had been laid waste during the war seemed likely to remain so during peace. King James, therefore, determined to plant, or, as we should now call it, to colonize the province of Ulster. The grants of land were eagerly taken up. The new colonists were farmers, merchants, mechanics, labourers. They established trade and manufactures, enclosed fields, built towns, and raised farm-houses and homesteads. The success of this colony pleased the king so well that a similar plan was adopted with regard to the forfeited lands in other parts of the island. Those employed in this business were not always so exact in carrying out their instructions as they should have been, and therefore grievances were felt, but much good was the result of this colonization.¹ The largest number of the settlers in Ulster came from Scotland and were presbyterians. It was about 1607 that colonists from the city of London proceeded thither, built the town of Derry, and purchased a large tract of land. Many of them were puritans, and this, together with the presbyterian feelings of the Scotch settlers, introduced an element into Ireland unfavourable to an episcopal form of church government, and the English Common Prayer and forms of service were neglected. Religion, as might be expected, was at a very low ebb in Ulster; most of the churches had been destroyed or had become ruinous; the income of the clergy was miserably small; the character of some was unsatisfactory, and divine service had been frequently omitted.

Various events had proved unfortunate to the Church in Ireland. When the puritans obtained a footing there, the leading lay members of the Church joined them against the bishops, with a view to enrich themselves with their revenues; the spoliation of the cathedrals and bishops' sees was so great that many dioceses had to be united to provide a sufficient income. This poverty extended to the inferior clergy, for the parochial tithes having been mostly appropriated to the religious houses during the papal sway, fell to the crown when the monasteries were dissolved and were conveyed by Henry VIII. and his successors into lay hands, by which means the vicarages were miserably endowed, especially in the western province of Connaught, and the influence of the bishops and clergy declined. The king endeavoured to remedy these abuses by restoring to the Church that which had belonged to it, with

¹ Carte's *Life of the Duke of Ormonde*, vol. i., p. 12—25. Froude's *English in Ireland*, ch. xi., p. 66—68.

the hope of maintaining both bishops and clergy. In order to provide a succession of worthy men for the ministry, he endowed free schools in different towns, and made considerable grants of land to Trinity college, which had been founded in Dublin by queen Elizabeth.¹

James having thus settled the country, resolved to call a parliament, which should represent the whole people, so that they might enact laws for the common good. Irish parliaments had been called from the reign of Edward II. from time to time on particular occasions, but until the reign of Henry VIII. the assembly was small, as some of the peers were usually in a state of discontent or rebellion, and did not think fit to attend, and those prelates who were resident amongst the native Irish were never summoned. And as for the house of commons it was composed only of deputies from that part which was called the Pale, for the native Irish were not summoned, being deemed inimical to the king's government and unfit to be trusted. The last parliament had been called about 1585, but now that the king had divided the whole kingdom into counties and erected new boroughs, it was resolved that the inhabitants should meet together, whether of the old Anglo-Norman extraction, or the old Irish natives, or the new British colony, and this they did in May, 1613.²

The reformation in Ireland met with a great check from the swarms of Jesuits and priests, natives of the country, who had been educated in the seminaries founded abroad by Philip II. They returned with feelings thoroughly hostile to the English government and the reformed Church, and soon gained an ascendancy over an ignorant and credulous people, and induced them to withdraw from attendance on the services of the Church. Their success in this is the less surprising when we consider that neither the Scriptures nor liturgy had been translated into the Irish tongue at the commencement of this reign, so that the people were ignorant of both. The influence which these new teachers acquired over their countrymen was such that they were ready to follow their advice in all things. The pope consecrated bishops for Ireland, and the following is the substance of an oath which was exacted from persons who came to confession:—That they would be obedient to the holy see and to the pope in all things spiritual and temporal; that they would defend and promote the Church of Rome and her laws against all resisting the same; that no acts made or to be made by heretical powers were of force, or to be practised or obeyed; and that father or mother, brother or sister, husband or wife, kinsman or kinswoman, mother or mistress, friend or acquaintance should be accursed, who should hold any ecclesiastical or civil office, or should obey any of the enemies or opposers of the pope.³

When the parliament was summoned, the Romanist party,

¹ Carte's *Ormonde*, vol. i., pp. 17, 18. Collier, vol. vii., p. 380.

² Carte's *Ormonde*, vol. i., p. 18.

³ Sir G. Ware's *Life and Death of Archbishop Browne of Dublin*, p. 151.

especially the ecclesiastics, fearing that laws might be framed which would be hostile to themselves, made great exertions to carry the elections for their own side, and by means of promises and threats, curses and excommunications, they succeeded in returning the most factious and discontented spirits. The parliament was not successful in promoting union, as party feeling ran high between the Romanists and the members of the reformed Church. The act of supremacy and the act of uniformity were looked upon as grievances, but were not so considered at first, for the bishops had complied with the Reformation, and the people in general attended the churches in which the English service was used, till towards the end of queen Elizabeth's reign.¹ We have mentioned the chief obstacles to the progress of Reformation and the causes which led to the revival of Romanism. The country was peaceable during the reign of James I., but circumstances and materials were at work which were likely to cause religious disturbances ere long.

The Welsh clung to the errors of popery for some time. The edition of the Bibles hitherto printed must have been small, as the parish churches do not appear to have been generally supplied. A revised translation, undertaken by Dr. Richard Parry, who succeeded bishop Morgan at St. Asaph, was printed in 1620: this is the Welsh version which is at present in use. Bishop Parry was a native of Denbighshire and educated at Westminster school, for some time under Camden, whence he was elected student of Christchurch, Oxford.² Another edition was printed about ten years later, through the benevolence of two aldermen of London, named Rowland Heylin and Sir Thomas Middleton. Other editions were published before the end of this century. The name of the Rev. Rhys Prichard, vicar of Llandovery, Carmarthenshire, is still familiar to his countrymen as the author of a volume of short poems on religious subjects written in easy and familiar language. It is popularly called the Vicar's book, but its proper name is "*Canwyll y Cymry*," or the "*Welshmen's Candle*," and it was so generally esteemed that many were induced to learn to read that they might be able to peruse this book. Prichard was also an eloquent preacher, and his congregations were so numerous that he was under the necessity of preaching to them in the churchyard.

James I. died in March, 1625. His love of peace was favourable to industry and commerce. Arbitrary in his ideas of kingly power, he had neither vigour of mind nor dignity of manner to support it; this lowered the influence of the crown at a time when a revolutionary spirit was rising. He prided himself upon his theological knowledge and delighted in religious disputations, and if, to use the language of his flatterers, he was the British Solomon, he also merited the remark of the duke of Sully, who said that "he was the wisest fool in Europe." James left to his son an empty exchequer and a foreign war.

¹ Carte's *Life of Ormonde*, pp. 19 and 33.

² Williams's *Eminent Welshmen*, p. 390.

CHAPTER XXVII.

CENTURY XVII.

FROM THE ACCESSION OF CHARLES I., 1625, TO THE RECALL OF WENTWORTH FROM IRELAND, 1640.

WITH the reign of Charles I. we enter upon troubled times in Church and state. King James had brought up his son with the same high notions of prerogative which he himself possessed, but in other respects the son was very unlike his father. Stately and dignified, with a cultivated mind and refined tastes, he yet wanted the prudence and foresight to govern wisely at such a critical time. Charles married the French princess in May. This union was an unfortunate event both for himself and the country, for Henrietta Maria acquired great influence over her husband, and used it most unwisely. A feeling of irritation between the crown and the house of commons was growing up, and there was one way in which the latter could effectually express its ill will, namely, by withholding or diminishing the supplies of money. After the queen's arrival in England, parliament was summoned, and the commons were asked for supplies to carry on the war. The king was anxious to recover the palatinate for his brother-in-law; the commons had been desirous to assist the German protestants and to check the power of Spain; but though money was essential to success, they did not respond to the royal application. They voted a small and insufficient sum. Their jealousy of the advance of Romanism on the continent seems to have given way to their distrust of the duke of Buckingham, while their anxiety to put the penal laws in execution against the English Romanists was increased by their suspicion that Charles's marriage had occasioned some concessions to be made to them. The king explained the purposes for which the supplies were required, but the commons declined to give more unless the money was to be spent under other advice than that of Buckingham. Charles felt that, if he abandoned his minister, he should be under the tutelage of the commons; and rather than submit to this, he dissolved parliament, by which step he increased the general discontent.¹ The conduct of the house in refusing supplies was ungenerous towards a young sovereign who had as yet committed no acts to call forth their anger, but they doubtless considered that the commencement of a new reign was a fitting time to gain some abatement of the royal power.

The revenues of the crown were extremely small, hence the excessive economy of Elizabeth, which she exercised as the only way to keep her independent of parliament. Buckingham endeavoured to carry on the war; but as affairs did not prosper, and the money

¹ See Gardiner, ch. iii., sec. 2.

ran short, a second parliament was summoned in 1626. The new house of commons was not more disposed to grant supplies than the former one had been, and its first act was a threatened impeachment of Buckingham, whom they looked upon as the cause of all the misfortunes of the war. If the commons magnified the bad traits in this minister's character, the king thought only of his better qualities—his undaunted courage, and his devotion to his sovereign's interests. He, therefore, resolved to protect his minister, and dissolved parliament before it had voted him a sixpence.

We have said that various circumstances had caused the sovereign to attain extraordinary power, and Elizabeth continued to possess it till the close of her reign; for though the influence of the commons was increasing, yet the queen's popularity prevented its being used against her; and by all the tact of a woman, added to all the boldness of a man, she staved off the evil day that was to bring the power of the crown and parliament into collision. When the revenues of the sovereign were derived from land and feudal perquisites, taxes were seldom levied, therefore supplies voted by the representatives of the people were of little consequence; but when those resources were lost to the crown, the power of granting money became of the utmost importance and invested the lower house of parliament with an influence of which they were fully conscious and were resolved to use; and they demanded as the price of the supplies they voted to the house of Stuart, that the breaches which the Tudor princes had made in the ancient liberties of England should be repaired. But neither the crown nor the commons yet understood their relative positions, and many a struggle took place and many a sad event occurred ere the rights of the sovereign and the liberty of the subject were fairly balanced. Charles pledged the crown plate and jewels, and endeavoured to obtain money from various sources; and as the country was not disposed to give in any other way, he sought to obtain funds by forced loans. It is true that this had been done by his predecessors, but it was an arbitrary act of the sovereign. A letter was sent to the bishops requiring them to urge the clergy to promote this object through their sermons, which placed them in a very unpleasant position, as by doing so they would be connected, in the eyes of the people, with the grievances by which so many real friends of liberty were oppressed.¹

In the mean time ill feeling arose between France and England; the queen's French attendants were dismissed by Charles, and war broke out between the two countries, in which England suffered great losses. Buckingham's unpopularity increased, and the need of supplies for payment of the fleet obliged the king to summon a third parliament. In this the principal members were Sir Thomas Wentworth (afterwards earl of Strafford) and Sir John Eliot, who agreed in their dislike of the influence of Buckingham, although there was a great contrast between the two men. Each desired im-

¹ *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland*, by Sir John Dalrymple, bart., 2 vols., ed. 1771, vol. i., ch. i. Also Bishop Short, p. 386.

portant reforms, but the mode in which they sought them was very different. Eliot believed the house of commons to possess all the wisdom of the country; Wentworth considered that such a large and heterogeneous body could not govern a great kingdom with advantage. Eliot felt, and rightly, that government could not be carried on except in agreement with the representatives of the nation; but he forgot that a popular assembly requires to be balanced by other influences. Wentworth felt, and rightly, that government could not be carried on except by men possessing abilities above the average; but he forgot that the support of the people is essential to their success. The coming revolution, so far as politics were concerned, resulted from this conflict of opinions; but religious feelings largely contributed to the impending struggle.

When the famous petition of right was drawn up and presented to the king, he did not object to some of its clauses; he was willing to give up forced loans, but hesitated upon one most important point—that no man should be committed to prison without the cause for his imprisonment being shown. But Charles needed money, and the commons would vote none unless the royal assent was given. The bill of rights was the first act which lessened the powers bequeathed by the Tudors to the Stuarts. No man could now be left untried in prison; every prisoner could appeal to the judges to appoint a day for his trial, but the star chamber and the high commission court still remained; both were under the immediate influence of the sovereign, and awarded punishment without the intervention of a jury. The commons desired many other alterations, but above all they wished to be rid of Buckingham; so Charles prorogued the parliament. That nobleman was preparing to embark at Portsmouth in order to direct the progress of the war with France, when he was assassinated by one John Felton, who had been brooding over the idea that the duke was an enemy to his country. Another commander was appointed, but the war was unsuccessful, and the king had to bear the unpopularity which failure causes, while the death of Buckingham did not remove the ill feeling which existed between him and the house of commons.¹

Hitherto we have spoken of political differences, but the religious disputes must now be referred to; it is, indeed, difficult to separate them, for both contributed to the misfortunes of this monarch's reign. The puritan spirit which had arisen in the reign of Elizabeth had been gradually gaining strength, and there were some who looked on the English reformed Church as an institution which could be neither altered nor modified, but should be abandoned by all true Christians. These became more violent in their opinions and more discontented with the government of the state as well as that of the Church. They have been described by various names, but that of separatists, or independents, best denotes them. They believed that each congregation of faithful men should form a separate community, and choose its own ministers for the sake of convenience;

¹ Gardiner, ch. iii., sec. 3 and 4.

but they did not observe any strict line of distinction between the ministers and laity. In 1608 a congregation of these people settled in Holland, but afterwards resolved to seek a new home in America. English settlers were already in Virginia, but these emigrants chose a more northern region, and in 1620 about a hundred sailed across the Atlantic in the 'Mayflower,' and commenced the settlement of the future New England, or Massachusetts. In 1630 about a thousand puritans joined them, and in their new home the principles of the separatists, or independents, were unquestioned. They had formed decisions upon doubtful passages of the Bible, and he who did not accept their interpretation was banished from the colony.¹ One of the most graceful of our female poets has celebrated the landing of the "pilgrim fathers in New England."

"The breaking waves dash'd high
On a stern and rock-bound coast,
And the woods against a stormy sky
Their giant branches tossed.

And the heavy night hung dark,
The hills and waters o'er,
When a band of exiles moored their bark
On the wild New England shore.

Amidst the storm they sang,
And the stars heard and the sea !
And the sounding aisles of the dim woods rang
To the anthem of the free.

The ocean eagle soared
From his nest by the white waves foam,
And the rocking pines of the forest roared—
This was their welcome home !

Ay, call it holy ground,
The soil where first they trod !
They have left unstained what there they found—
Freedom to worship God."

MRS. HEMANS.

Truth, however, compels us to say that the two last lines are more beautiful than correct, for though the pilgrims undoubtedly sought "freedom" for themselves, they allowed none to those who differed from them, and their acts of uniformity, though not carried out under that title, were more rigidly enforced than such acts had ever been in the old country. No person was admitted to the rights of a citizen who had not previously been admitted as a member of one of the independent churches. Non-attendance on their services was punished. In 1651 a Mr. Obadiah Holmes was "well whipt" for being a baptist. Roger Williams, a native of Conwil Gaio, Carmarthenshire, who had settled at Salem, New England, adopted anabaptist principles, and denied the right to take lands from the Indians without purchase. He also claimed liberty of faith and worship for all, and would thus have bestowed the gift of religious liberty. For maintaining these principles he was banished from

¹ Gardiner, ch. iv., sec. 5,

the colony in 1635. He escaped to the shores of Narraganset bay, and after much suffering found shelter amongst the Indians, whose language he had learnt. In June, 1636, he landed with five comrades at Rhode island, and named the place where he settled, Providence. The chief of the territory made a large portion of land over to Roger Williams, and the state of Rhode island was thus founded by him. In 1656 the quakers were attacked; it was enacted that any quaker who landed on the coast of Massachusetts, or New England, should be whipped, then imprisoned, and finally expelled. Afterwards every male quaker, besides those penalties, was to lose one ear on the first conviction, and the other on a second, and, on the third, both males and females were to have their tongues bored through with a red-hot iron.¹

The puritans were numerous in England, and possessed great influence in the house of commons. The king's marriage to a Romanist princess had aroused the fears of the nation; protestantism had met with serious reverses on the continent; Calvinistic doctrines, especially on the subject of predestination, had gained ground largely, and any deviation from them was considered a step towards popery, or towards that which was called Arminianism. In Charles's first parliament the commons summoned Montague, one of the king's chaplains, before them; censured the books he had written, and obliged him to give security for £2000 for his further appearance. The king considered these proceedings to be an unwarrantable stretch of their jurisdiction; and in a letter written to his majesty on Montague's behalf by three of the bishops, it was stated that the opinions put forth in Mr. Montague's book were, some of them, the express doctrine of the Church of England, and some such as learned men are left at liberty to expound in their own way; for when the English Church reformed herself from the errors of the Church of Rome, she would not be too busy with every point, and held to this moderation because unity could not be preserved amongst Christians if men were forced to subscribe to every disputed particular; also that it was decided in the time of Henry VIII. that if any doctrinal or other difficulty arose in the Church it was to be judged of in a national synod or convocation, the king giving leave under his seal to do so. In the second parliament the commons appointed a committee of religion, this being the first time we hear of such a committee in the house, and a report upon the subject was brought up by Pym; but as it does not appear that Montague was brought to his defence, it may be concluded that the matter regarding him was dropped. As controversies on the points of predestination and election continued, the king, with the assent of the bishops, put forth a declaration which is to this day prefixed to the thirty-nine articles of religion in the prayer book. It was intended to be conciliatory, and required that the articles should be taken in their literal sense, and "these disputes shut up in God's

¹ Bancroft's *History of the United States* (Routledge, 1859), vol. i., p. 276—289, and p. 338—344.

promises, as they be generally set forth to us in the Holy Scriptures, and the general meaning of the articles of the Church of England according to them."¹

The commons seem to have considered themselves the rulers of the Church when they criticized Montague's theological opinions; but they had a more just cause of complaint against another of the king's chaplains, doctor Mainwaring. His sermons, preached in 1627 before the king at Whitehall, advanced opinions which were contrary to all civil liberty, and asserted the sovereign's right to impose loans and taxes without the consent of parliament, together with other extravagant commendations of arbitrary power. For this he was impeached, and sentenced by the house of peers to be imprisoned, and fined £1000; to make acknowledgment of his offence, to be suspended from the exercise of the ministry for three years, and to be incapable thereafter of holding any ecclesiastical dignity or secular office; this suspension to be carried out by the ecclesiastical authorities, and his majesty was requested to call in his sermons that they might be burnt. The submission which he signed was written out by a committee of the house of commons.²

When parliament met again in 1629, after the prorogation, the members turned their attention to what they called new ceremonies in the Church. In Durham cathedral the services were conducted in very much the same manner as they are in cathedrals at the present day. This mode of worship gave offence to the puritan party, and violent speeches were made, in which Neile, bishop of Winchester, Laud, then bishop of London, and other clergy were accused of holding Arminian (by which was meant anti-Calvinistic) doctrines. The puritan party declared that their interpretation of the thirty-nine articles was true, and every other interpretation false. At this time arose the question of tonnage and poundage, and the customs duties, which the commons were unwilling to grant to the king. Some merchants in London had refused to pay the duties, amongst whom was a member of the house of commons named Rolle; his goods had been seized by the custom-house officers, and the commons maintained that by so doing the officers had invaded their privileges. But as the house was not sitting at the time, Rolle had not been in any way prevented from attending to his parliamentary duties; and if a merchant was to escape payment merely because he was a member of the house of commons, what was to be done for other merchants who were not so placed? This claim to privilege was unreasonable, and though supported by Sir John Eliot, it was not approved by Pym, whose anxiety to resist arbitrary power was quite as strong.

In this reign the leading points of interest in civil and ecclesiastical history are so closely connected, that it is necessary to enter somewhat into matters which do not strictly belong to the latter in order to explain how the Church and monarchy fell together, and how

¹ See preface to the Thirty-nine Articles in the Book of Common Prayer.

² Collier, vol. viii., p. 2—14, and p. 28.

each was interested in the preservation of the other. The determination of the commons to keep the crown short of money obliged those who governed to resort to many arbitrary expedients for raising funds; and as the success of these expedients depended on the power of the sovereign, all that tended to augment that power was acceptable to those in authority.¹ The king was strongly attached to the Church of England, and resented the attacks which were made upon her by her puritan opponents. His councils were influenced by churchmen; and Laud, who had taken a leading part in public affairs from the commencement of Charles's reign, became still more prominent after the death of Buckingham.

We must now retrace our steps a little in order to give a slight sketch of this prelate and of the state of parties in the Church of England during the preceding seventy years. To archbishop Parker we are indebted more largely than any other prelate of the sixteenth century for the preservation of the catholic and apostolic doctrines of our Church. He knew that revision and reform were required, but he would not give up truth in order to win partisans. "The motto of our Church," says Dean Hook, "is the truth; the whole truth as against puritans, and nothing but the truth as against Romanists." Parker was supported by queen Elizabeth, though the Church suffered by her attacks upon its property, and in the primacy of Whitgift this evil was to a great extent remedied. During the middle ages our Church was not in possession of a Book of Common Prayer, but various dioceses adopted different formularies under the title of 'uses.' Thus, there was Salisbury use, Hereford use, Bangor use, &c. The adoption of one liturgy for the entire Church was a grand idea, and when, on the accession of Elizabeth, the Book of Common Prayer was finally established, archbishop Parker did not seek to please either foreigners or sects, but adhered to the primitive truth.² The influence of Calvinism in the Church, which was introduced into England partly by the divines who were driven abroad in the time of Mary, and partly by those who were driven hither by the French and Spanish persecutions, was in a measure subdued during the primacy of Bancroft; but the unfortunate appointment of Abbot as his successor prepared the way for the troubles which beset the Church in Charles's reign. The laxity of discipline which Abbot imagined was merely making allowance for scruples of conscience, in reality created a lawlessness which produced disastrous consequences. The chief incidents of Abbot's primacy have been already mentioned. He presided at the coronation of Charles I. The papist prejudices of the queen prevented her joining in the solemn ceremony, it being the policy of Rome to object to all acts which were performed by the prelates of England's reformed Church. Towards the close of Abbot's life he decided, with regard to a dispute amongst the parishioners of Crayford, in Kent, that, for the more reverent reception of the

¹ Gardiner, ch. iv., sec. 2. Bishop Short, p. 385.

² Dean Hook, introduction to vol. vi., new series.

Holy Communion, the parishioners should receive it kneeling at the steps which led up to the holy table at the east end of the church. By this it would appear that he was becoming sensible of the ill effects of the irregularities which prevailed in public worship.¹

William Laud, the son of a clothier in a large business in the town of Reading, was educated at Oxford about 1589, under the tuition of doctor Buckeridge, who was a devoted adherent of our reformed Church, and distinguished for his learning. Laud's manners were not conciliatory, and to this, joined to a somewhat hasty temper, may be ascribed much of the unpopularity which he afterwards incurred. The university of Oxford at that time was much influenced by the puritan party, who received great support from the chancellor, Elizabeth's favourite, the earl of Leicester; the leader of the party at Oxford being doctor George Abbot, then vice-chancellor. By this party the theory of Calvin as to predestination was held to be essential; the efficacy of the two sacraments was disputed or denied; and the authority of the Church disregarded. These tenets were controverted by William Laud, who had become divinity lecturer at St. John's, which opposition was not forgiven by Abbot, and the accusation of being a friend of popery was freely brought against the young divine. His firmness and consistency were, however, the admiration even of those who disagreed with him; in 1611 he became president of St. John's college, and one of king James's chaplains, and about 1616 dean of Gloucester. The cathedral in that city had been very much neglected, the building was out of repair, and the services were performed in a most meagre and negligent manner. King James had requested the new dean to establish the needful reforms, but Laud was opposed in his endeavours to restore order by the bishop, who was a strong Calvinist. The latter especially objected to the communion table being placed at the east end of the choir; indeed, this arrangement, which is the most reverent, and the most suitable to our church service, and which was a restoration to primitive usage, was one of the points on which the puritans were most unreasonable, and the endeavour to enforce that position of the table in those cathedrals and churches where it had been otherwise placed, brought Laud into much disfavour with this party in after years.

Laud was consecrated bishop of St. David's in 1621. It will be remembered that the ancient see of Caerleon had been removed there about A.D. 519, and that the Welsh bishops were independent until the reign of Henry I., when they submitted to the archbishop of Canterbury. When bishop Laud was appointed, the city of St. David's was but a village; and the bishop's palace being in ruins, the episcopal residence had been removed to Abergwili, near Carmarthen. The diocese was very large, but the parishes were comparatively few, and of these several were impropriations. On the visitation of his diocese, Laud urged upon his clergy a due observance of the ordinances of the Church. Many of them, who

¹ Dean Hook, vol. v., new series, pp. 296, 304.

thought their sole duty was to preach, were careless as to other church matters, especially in relation to the ministration of the sacraments.

In December, 1625, Charles I. issued letters to the two archbishops, requiring them to take measures for repressing both popery and puritanism. Archbishop Abbot attended to the first but neglected the second point; and thus, by remissness combined with laxity of discipline, he continued to encourage disorders in the Church and to prepare the way for future difficulties. When Laud again visited his diocese, he travelled through every part of it and consecrated the chapel which had been erected at his own expense in the episcopal residence at Abergwili. The mistake of the king's marriage with a Romanist princess was soon made evident, and during the ceremony of the coronation, in which she refused to take part, she had the bad taste to amuse herself in dancing and other frivolities in view of the public. The English coronation service is probably the most ancient in the world; the puritans expressed displeasure at many of the ceremonies, and afterwards invented charges against Laud respecting them, encouraged thereto by the false accusations of Prynne; though Laud on this occasion acted only as dean of Westminster under the authority of archbishop Abbot. In 1626 Laud was made bishop of Bath and Wells, and afterwards became one of the king's privy council. The queen was his great enemy, for she knew that he was thoroughly opposed to popery; yet the influence which she possessed over the king was never able to shake his attachment either to Laud or to the Church. In 1628 Laud succeeded to the bishopric of London; and when Charles's third parliament met, the opening sermon, which was preached by him from Ephes. iv. 3, "Endeavouring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace," was distinguished by eloquence and sound reasoning, and ended with these words: "I began with St. Paul's exhortation; I end with his prayer and benediction. It is the prayer of the day, for it is the second lesson at evening service. 'The God of peace give you peace always, and by all means; peace in concord, and peace in charity; peace on earth, and peace in heaven; peace of grace, and peace in glory. To all which, Christ of his infinite mercies' sake bring us all.'"¹ But, alas, this prayer for peace, like that of Lord Falkland at a later period, fell upon unwilling ears, as the stormy scenes which followed testified.

Before returning to the proceedings of parliament, it may be useful to give some explanation of the origin of the word Arminianism, which was so freely employed by the puritan party as a reproach against members of the Church. The term was derived from James Von Harmine, or Arminius, who was a native of Holland; he had in his early years been a pupil of Beza, and had spent some time at Geneva. Distinguished for ability and learning, he became exceedingly popular as a preacher at Amsterdam, and in 1603 was elected professor of divinity at Leyden. He became involved in

¹ Dean Hook, vol. vi., new series: see ch. xxxiii. and xxxiv.

the disputes respecting the Calvinistic doctrines of predestination and election which divided the reformers in Holland, and, being filled with doubts in regard to some of Calvin's opinions, wrote and argued against them. The controversy was so bitter, and raised towards him so much ill will, that his health gave way, and he died in 1609.

As the dispute between the two parties continued, a synod was held in Holland at Dort, in 1618, which was attended by some divines of the English Church at the desire of James I. The Calvinist party succeeded in upholding their opinions, but it has been remarked that the decisions of the synod were far too peremptory, and defined beyond what the revealed word of God has declared. When they are compared with the articles of our Church, we find cause to admire the more cautious expressions and the nearer approach to the spirit of the Bible which are displayed in the latter.¹

The house of commons continued its discussion upon the question of privilege, but Pym took a broader view of the case than Sir John Eliot. "The liberties of this house," he said, "are inferior to the liberties of this kingdom," and his advice was to claim for all subjects the right of refusing to pay the duty till it had been voted by parliament. But the commons chose to follow Eliot. Amidst tumult and confusion, the debate—if debate it can be called—proceeded; they determined to prepare a declaration which should serve as an appeal to the people. Sir John Eliot's resolutions were read, though with locked doors and against the wish of the speaker. They were plain enough to be understood by all men. Whoever brought in innovations in religion or introduced opinions disagreeing from those of the true and orthodox Church; whoever advised the levy of tonnage and poundage (customs duties) without a grant from parliament; whoever voluntarily paid those duties was to be counted an enemy to the kingdom and a betrayer of its liberties. The house adjourned, but in a few days was dissolved, and for eleven years no parliament met in England. Sir John Eliot and others who had supported him were imprisoned; they refused to acknowledge the authority of the judges, but eventually all submitted except Eliot, who died in the tower in 1632. Sir John Eliot was the first champion of parliamentary independence; but he would have carried its power beyond that point, and made the house of commons supreme. The house of peers in the reign of Charles was but a shadow of what it had been, and the lower house had become the chief depository of the national will. The patriotism of Eliot cannot be questioned; but had his views been fully carried out, they would have led to a tyranny none the less because exercised by many. Had the king been asked if he intended to trample the law under foot, he would have recoiled from the idea and replied that he was the supporter of the law. For always, in theory, and, since the accession of the house of Tudor, in practice, parliament had been but the great council of the sovereign, and the sovereign had been the centre

¹ Collier, vol. vii., p. 402. Bishop Short, p. 363

of government. What the commons now desired was to take his place, and they resolved to keep him short of money till he complied with their wishes.¹

In this struggle we feel grateful for every step taken towards establishing our liberties, but we are obliged to distinguish between the patriots and the puritans. The patriots were fighting for the freedom of the people; the puritans were resolved to enslave their minds. Freedom of thought, except that which they approved, was to be stamped out in England; nothing but Calvinism within very narrow limits was to be tolerated; none should preach a sermon or write a book without the leave of the majority of the house of commons. Some of the leading patriots left the puritan party, and attached themselves with more or less confidence to the court. Of this number were Falkland, Wentworth (afterwards lord Strafford), and Hyde (afterwards lord Clarendon). The two latter were personal friends of Laud. Though Pym was not a puritan, he and others combined with that party in order to secure a majority against the court. Constant intercourse had its usual effect, and they at length became infected with that fiery fanaticism by which charity in religion was destroyed. The house of commons was trying to establish an ecclesiastical tyranny, which Charles and his ministers saw the necessity of resisting; and they fell back upon the prerogative of the crown, and if Charles could have rallied England round him by a wiser policy than he had yet adopted, he might have waited a few years for another parliament, and yet the royal cause might have been uninjured; but he had not the wisdom to see that there was truth amidst his opponents' errors, nor to perceive that he could not govern permanently without the good will of the nation, which parliament represented. His mind became accustomed to consider parliament as unnecessary, and the public opinion on which it rested, as a thing to be kept down. As the courts of star chamber and high commission could fine and imprison, and as the judges were appointed and dismissed by the crown, and there was no parliament to complain, Charles was during these years practically absolute.²

Laud and Wentworth were the king's principal counsellors. Peace was made with France in 1629, and with Spain in 1630; the king was greatly distressed at having to abandon the cause of his sister, Elizabeth the queen of Bohemia, whose qualities of mind and person obtained for her the title of the "queen of Hearts."

Wentworth entered the privy council in 1629. The events of that stormy session had decided his conduct. The claim of the leaders of the commons to force their peculiar religious views on all who differed from them must have been regarded by him with extreme dislike, but, by joining the king's party, he became the special object of their aversion. His manners were stately, and his character austere; but his fidelity to his sovereign was unshaken. "Justice

¹ Gardiner, ch. iv., sec. 1, 2.

² Dean Hook, vol. vi., p. 149. Gardiner, ch. iv., sec 3.

without respect of persons" was the motto of his life. He inquired into the execution of the poor law, devised measures for the relief of commerce and for an improvement in the condition of the people, and endeavoured to make life more tolerable for those who were in distress; but he neglected public opinion, and held popularity in contempt, and did not draw out the love and sympathy of those whom he governed.

Laud has been charged with having introduced innovations into the Church; but the real innovators were the puritans, who had very generally disobeyed the laws which had been laid down for the regulation of divine service in the previous reigns. Laud insisted that those laws should be strictly observed. Those who live under a constitution which has been developed by slow degrees and has become a model to foreign nations, find it difficult to realize the position of a statesman of the seventeenth century. Laud thought that he was doing his duty in opposing those changes which are justly regarded in these days as the foundations of English liberty. It is true that those who, like Laud and Strafford, desired to support the royal prerogative, did not make generous concessions to the people, and only yielded to pressure. But on the other hand, it must be allowed that until the reign of James I. parliament had been expected, not to suggest measures, but to consider what the crown offered for debate. As a prelate, Laud's firmness and energy removed many abuses, and he encouraged those who employed their abilities on behalf of the Church. We still look to the divines of this century (the Caroline divines, as they are called) as the great authorities for English theology, as distinguished from popery and puritanism. Most of these divines were brought forward and encouraged by Laud,¹ whose influence in the diocese of London caused a better observance of the Book of Common Prayer; so that the rules of the Church were less evaded than they had been since Abbot had become archbishop. Laud's reverence for the prayer book was felt by others; to him and to other devoted sons and daughters of the English communion, the forms of Church worship, the pealing organ, the painted window, were true aids to devotion. To quote the words of the great puritan poet, they loved

"the high embowered roof,
With antique pillars massy-proof,
And storied windows richly dight,
Casting a dim religious light."

MILTON.

The first five years of government without a parliament were on the whole peaceful. The conduct of the opposition in the last session, and Sir John Eliot's proceedings at that time, had been disapproved by Pym and others. Foreign affairs were also in a more satisfactory state, and Romanism was checked in Germany.

An association had been formed a few years previously under the

¹ Gardiner, ch. iv., sec. iii. Dean Hook, vi., pp. 151, 162.

pretence of aiding the established clergy in preaching, but the object in view was really to set up a new class of lecturers in convenient places, for the promoting of the puritan cause. Certain lay impropriations were purchased and entrusted to a body of men called feoffees, who formed themselves into a kind of corporation, though they had neither the king's letters patent nor any act of parliament for their warrant. The persons who were most active in this project were of the presbyterian party, and as the plan set forth had an appearance of piety, large sums of money were in a short time placed at their disposal. Their mode of proceeding, however, soon displayed their intentions; they did not restore the impropriations to the churches to which they originally belonged, nor did they employ them to assist the incomes of the parochial clergy, but divided a portion of the funds into sums of £40 to £50 a year, with which they engaged lecturers who were well known as disaffected to the discipline of the Church, and whom they placed in market towns, especially in those which sent members to parliament. The lecturers were not engaged for life or for any term of years, but were entirely dependent upon the pleasure of their patrons, and required to suit their doctrines to the taste of their employers. Another portion of the funds was assigned to schoolmasters, and to students at the universities, and some part was employed in pensions to those of the clergy who had been silenced for noncompliance with the usages of the Church, and in support of their families after their death. It will thus be seen that the whole scheme was a device for the overthrow of Church government. The entire fund was employed in contention against both Church and state, for those who were hostile to the first were at this time usually disaffected to the other. Laud perceived the evil that was intended; the feoffees were prosecuted by the attorney-general, the feoffments cancelled in the court of exchequer, and the impropriations confiscated to the use of the crown.¹ This increased the animosity with which Laud was assailed.

Queen Elizabeth, when she wished to prepare the nation for any of her measures, began by what she called "tuning the pulpits." It might have been well and needful thus to instruct the people on contemplated changes in ecclesiastical matters during the progress of the Reformation, but the enemies of the Church and the monarchy had learnt the same policy, and tuning the pulpits became a favourite measure during the next few years; neither can it be said that this tuning is altogether forgotten by the nonconformists of the present day.

Charles I., like his father, had acquired at an early age a considerable amount of theological knowledge, and was warmly attached to the liturgy and doctrines of the Church of England. During the whole of his reign he was actuated by the desire that the church services should be identical throughout the kingdom, and this was the principal cause of a visit in 1633 to the land of his birth, in which

¹ Collier, viii., 59. Dean Hook, vi., p. 180.

he was accompanied by Laud, bishop of London. He arrived at Edinburgh in June, and was crowned in Holyrood palace by the archbishop of St Andrew's. The cathedral and monastic churches still remained in the state of desolation to which the excesses of Knox and his followers had reduced them. Some had been fitted up in the presbyterian fashion. The parish churches were in a miserable state, as the lay impropiators had wholly neglected their obligation to repair, and time had assisted the ruin which violence began.¹

The Scottish parliament met, and it was at this time that the system was established for the foundation and support of parish schools, which provided the poor with a cheap and scriptural education. A statute was passed which enabled the bishop, with the consent of the heritors (or landholders) of each parish, or of the majority of the inhabitants, to assess every farm in proportion to its size with a certain sum for the endowment of a school. The king was aware that the incomes of the parochial clergy were lamentably small, for instead of receiving the tithes of the parish originally settled upon the cure, they had only a poor stipend which they could not always command, and were thus placed in a very dependent position. The tithe system was therefore adjusted by an act called the *Surrenders*, which passed through parliament, and which secured for the body of the clergy a permanent though frugal endowment. The decrees passed in the reign of Charles I. still regulate the right to tithes, and the payments of the stipends to the ministers of the established Church in Scotland; but many of the nobility were indignant at being deprived of a portion of the money of which they had robbed the Church, and watched for an opportunity of revenging themselves upon their sovereign. The justice and benevolence of the arrangement are now acknowledged by all parties.² Thus Charles conferred upon Scotland two great boons: an endowment for the clergy, and education for the poor. He also acquired a share of the old endowments for the two metropolitan sees, and some estates were bought in the same way and given to other bishoprics. It is said that, encouraged by this success, the king contemplated a further restoration of ecclesiastical property to the Church; but as many of the nobles had derived a large share of their incomes from these sacrilegious gains, they were alarmed at the proposal, and only a strong government could have carried it out. Burnet states that the earl of Nithsdale was sent to Scotland with a commission to this effect, but he was intimidated by the threats of the chief impropiators. It is even said that had he persevered, the opposing nobles intended to massacre him and his friends. This statement wants confirmation, but the avaricious and savage proceedings of the Scotch nobles of that period renders such a narrative probable. During this visit of the king the bishopric of Edinburgh was founded, to which doctor Forbes was appointed;

¹ Grub, vol. ii., p. 362.

² Grub, vol. ii., p. 337. Russell, vol. ii., p. 117.

a most excellent and able man, by whose death the Church afterwards sustained a great loss.

Charles, however, did not give satisfaction to his Scottish subjects. He had, as we have seen, alarmed the nobility, who had no inclination to part with the revenues they had obtained from the Church; the presbyterian party was displeased by the favour shewn to episcopalians, and the nobles resented the elevation of the prelates to high offices of state.¹

We have already named that the assembly at Aberdeen in the reign of James I. had agreed to draw up a liturgy; but the governors of the Church, warned by some tokens of popular aversion to any sudden change, had permitted the former usage to continue. The English liturgy was introduced in the royal chapel at Holyrood, and occasionally in some of the cathedrals and colleges, but in the country at large the clergy read a portion of the prayers in the book formerly used and added an extemporaneous address. It is admitted that the religious services were performed in a slovenly manner. The bishops had their seats in parliament, and the parochial clergy took an oath of obedience to them and were ordained according to the English ritual. But the prelates appear to have exercised little spiritual jurisdiction, and neither the nobles nor people seem at that time to have been inimical to their order, or to the amount of episcopal authority which they wielded.

James I. had been careful in the appointment of bishops; he caused the archbishop of St. Andrew's to consult with his brethren, and select three or four of the most suitable clergy for the office, out of whom the king made choice of one; so that generally those recommended were such as were best adapted to promote the real interests of the Church. It has been said that Charles abolished this good custom, and that the new bishops, being in no way indebted to the older ones for their promotion, paid less regard to their wishes, which did not tend to a good understanding between them. They treated the clergy with less consideration, and induced Laud to advocate measures which were not acceptable.² It was by Laud's advice that the bishops were appointed to high civil offices, a plan which he had approved of in England, thinking thereby to strengthen the Church against the attacks made upon her. It did not, however, act well in either country, but excited the jealousy of the nobles in Scotland, and brought the heads of the Church into disrepute with the nation at large, since those acts of the king which were unpopular or arbitrary were laid to their charge.

It had been intended to adopt for Scotland, the English liturgy as ratified in the reign of queen Elizabeth; but the prelates, aware of the jealousy felt by the Scottish people towards their English neighbours, advised that some alterations should be made, and that the book should be announced as having been compiled for Scotland.

¹ Collier, viii., p. 66. Russell, ii., p. 117—126. Grub, vol. ii., p. 336.

² Grub says that these statements respecting Charles's selection of the bishops are not borne out by ecclesiastical documents. See vol. ii., p. 380.

The communion service printed in the first liturgy of Edward VI. was also preferred, but some objections were taken to this, and it would probably have been wiser to have avoided such an occasion for arousing the spleen of those who were determined to find fault. The king had many reasons for supposing the liturgy would not be ill received; the Scotch who attended his court seemed pleased with the mode of worship; the services in the royal chapel at Holyrood were attended by the privy council, nobility, and judges, and by women of all ranks; and the people of Edinburgh had ever since the Reformation been used to liturgical forms in their public worship. The project of introducing the English liturgy was, however, not carried out during Charles's visit to Scotland, and before proceeding further on this subject we must return to English affairs.¹

The king returned to his court at Greenwich in July. Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury, who had been for some time in failing health, died in August. He was most liberal in his bequests and benefactions. By his own desire, he was buried in his native town of Guildford, where he had built a hospital which is to this day a blessing to the place; while Oxford, Canterbury, and Lambeth were also remembered by him; but he left to his successor, as Clarendon observes, a very difficult work—to reform and put in order the church that had been so long neglected, and in which were many weak and wilful churchmen. Laud, bishop of London, succeeded to the primacy. The difficulties with which he had to contend were many and great, for the puritan party in the Church had had their way to such a large extent, and had met with so much sympathy from the late archbishop, that the task of restoring order was one which involved Laud in ever increasing unpopularity. Clarendon says he was always “persecuted by those who were of the Calvinian faction, which was then very powerful, and who, according to their useful maxim and practice, call every man they do not love, papist.” The archbishop had been accused of popery because he opposed the doctrines of Calvin. This was before Arminius and his opinions had been heard of; but when the term Arminianism was brought into use, it was an additional term of reproach and meant that all who held those opinions, if not papists, intended to introduce popery.² Laud's uncompromising spirit ill suited him for the times in which he lived, whether we regard him as a ruler in the Church or as a counsellor to the sovereign. In his endeavour to repair the churches, and to restore uniformity in the services, and discipline amongst the clergy, his designs were not always successful, whether from the expense attending the first or from harshness in carrying out the other reforms.³

The re-issue, in October, 1633, of the *Book of Sports*, which had been put forth but withdrawn in the late reign, met with much opposition; king James's proclamation was now accompanied by a declaration that the king would not allow his poorer subjects to be

¹ Collier, viii., p. 62. Russell, ii., p. 126—130.

² Clarendon, b. i., p. 36—38.

³ Collier, viii., p. 81.

curtailed of their liberty with regard to their lawful amusements on the Sunday. Much controversy had taken place respecting the manner in which Sunday should be passed. During the period when Romanism had prevailed, great laxity had existed with regard to the observance of the day. It had been the custom to attend divine service in the morning, and spend the afternoon in sports of various kinds. This had continued during Elizabeth's reign and that of her successor, though a sentiment of disapproval seems gradually to have spread. Some would give the day no other name than the 'sabbath,' and enjoined a strict observance of it from Saturday evening to the following night, allowing of no recreation but walking. Others considered that those parts of the day which were not devoted to religious exercises might be spent in various amusements. In the proclamation now issued a much greater degree of recreation was allowed than succeeding generations have approved of, and not only the puritans, but many of the orthodox clergy were displeased at this step. They were enjoined to read the declaration in their churches, which became a stumbling-block to many sincere men. Some utterly refused to read it, while others did so, but immediately afterwards read the fourth commandment, or preached on the due observance of the day. Laud incurred great unpopularity by this proceeding, especially as some of these clergy were prosecuted in the high commission court. The appearance of the declaration was a signal for a general outcry from the more rigorous sabbatarians, and it is now generally admitted to have been both inexpedient and unwise.

As to the manner in which the day should be kept, so few directions are given in the New Testament that latitude of opinion might naturally have been expected regarding it. Our Lord's words seem to show that the strictness of the Jewish sabbath was to be done away with. The generally received opinion, and that which best agrees with the institutions of the Church of England, seems to be that the dedication of one day in seven to the worship of God is part of the moral law; that the change of this day from Saturday to Sunday is sanctioned by the custom of the apostles, and that a day of rest from worldly labour is good both morally and spiritually.¹

The Church is indebted to this archbishop for the revival of a canonical regulation, that no person should receive holy orders without a title; in other words, without some appointment or employment in the Church, which would give him a maintenance. This rule had never been enforced by Abbot, and many indigent clerical adventurers had been the result of its omission. Had it been steadily applied, it would have prevented much confusion and protected the Church against the influx of an undisciplined force of what Heylyn calls "vagrant ministers." As the measure had been long disused, it was called by the enemies of Laud an arbitrary innovation, but that

¹ Bishop Short, p. 390—393. Collier, viii., p. 76.

it was both wise and useful is proved by the general adherence to it which has continued to the present day.¹

About the same time that Laud had been made bishop of London, Montague was consecrated to the see of Chichester, and Mainwaring was also made a bishop. The punishment which parliament had inflicted on the latter divine might have been needlessly severe; but his promotion showed great contempt for the opinion of the nation, and served to connect the Church in the minds of the people with that party which was against the liberty of the subject. Again, when more of the prelates became members of the privy council and of the star chamber and court of high commission, the people connected the proceedings of those courts with the rulers of the Church, and they suffered odium accordingly.²

As archbishop Laud has been frequently accused of Romanizing tendencies, we may mention that he offended the queen by telling the king that there were Romanists who had been too busy about the court, and beseeching his majesty to have some restraint put upon them, so that they should either be prohibited from coming there or be more quiet and inoffensive in their behaviour. The expostulation had a good effect, but the queen was displeased. Laud's conversion of Chillingworth was another instance of his hostility to Romish errors. Chillingworth had been induced by the Jesuit Fisher to renounce the Anglican communion, and had gone to the college of the Jesuits at Douay. At this Laud, then bishop of London, was greatly concerned, and wrote to him on the subject, continuing the correspondence and pressing upon him several arguments against the doctrines and practices of the Romanists. The result was that Chillingworth left Douay, and, rejoining the Church of England, became distinguished as a theological writer.

The chapel at Lambeth had been suffered by Laud's predecessor to fall into a state of disorder and decay; but this state of things was soon corrected by the archbishop, and the whole building repaired and beautified. This example was not lost upon his own university, and the college chapels at Oxford were restored and improved.³ The cathedrals also were generally in a very unfit condition for the due celebration of divine worship. Laud began the work of restoration in his own cathedral of Canterbury, and took such effectual measures with regard to others that they at length began to regain something of their former dignity. Many of the parochial churches required the same attention to recover them from the effects of past neglect. In such improvements there is nothing to censure; indeed, it is difficult in these days to imagine the perverse feeling which objected to decent solemnity in the public services, for our cathedrals and churches are now for the most part in the condition in which Laud wished to place them. But an outcry against the Romish practices of the archbishop was

¹ *Life of Archbishop Laud*, by C. Webb Le Bas, M.A., p. 176.

² Bishop Short, p. 387.

³ Collier, viii., p. 148. *Life of Laud*, by Le Bas, pp. 206, 241.

serviceable to one of the political parties at that day. It kept the people in a state of irritation and alarm, and prepared them for those extreme measures against the Church which followed.¹ The charge of innovation against Laud was groundless; but many who esteemed and honoured him thought his correction of the existing disorders was too hasty, and that he did not sufficiently remember that the work required not only firmness, but more than ordinary patience and conciliation.

In 1634 occurred the celebrated attempt to raise funds for the navy by means of ship-money. In the time of queen Elizabeth, and again in 1626, the maritime counties had been called upon to furnish ships for the defence of the country. That, however, was in the time of war. England was now in the enjoyment of peace. In 1635 another writ was issued in which not only the maritime counties, but every shire in England was required to contribute money for this purpose. The plea was resistance to encroachments by the French and Dutch in the channel; but it was observed that if the king claimed the right of deciding without a parliament when he should raise money for a navy, he might do the same when he required it for an army. The spirit of opposition was aroused, and the name of John Hampden will ever be connected with the noble stand he made to resist this arbitrary act. He was assessed at only twenty shillings, but in his case, as in many others, it was not the value of the tax, but the principle involved, that caused him to refuse payment. The case was tried, and though a majority of the judges decided against him, their decision was ascribed to timidity, and the arguments of Hampden's counsel were welcomed as the true reading of the law, the people having become thoroughly alive to the danger which threatened their liberties.²

In 1634 a barrister of the name of Prynne had written a book in which were inserted words that reflected on the queen, and for which he was punished by the star chamber, and three years later he (with Bastwick, a doctor of medicine, and Burton, a tutor or schoolmaster) was again before that court. Their violent and scurrilous attacks upon Church government, upon the archbishop of Canterbury and other prelates, were such, that in the days of Henry VIII. and his immediate successors they would have been put to death. Prynne spoke of the archbishop as "arch-agent for the devil," Bastwick of the prelates generally, as "enemies of every living thing that is good," and Burton, as "robbers of souls, ravening wolves, and sons of Belial." The punishment of Prynne in 1634 had caused little excitement; but the times were now altered, and when these three men were placed in the pillory, which sentence was always accompanied by amputation of the ears, the popular sympathy was roused to the utmost. A fine and imprisonment was added to the sentence, and had these latter punishments

¹ Le Bas, *Life of Laud*, p. 205—207.

² Gardiner, ch. v., sec. 2. See also Freeman's *Norman Conquest*, vol. i., p. 336, for the ancient custom of an assessment for ships, by the witenagemot.

been the only ones inflicted on the offenders, they could not have been thought severe, considering the violence of their language and writings, and their endeavours to excite the people against their religious teachers; but the barbarous punishment of mutilation is revolting to human nature, and had the effect of raising men to the position of martyrs who were otherwise unworthy of sympathy. The odium of the sentence has been fastened upon Laud, because he was a member of the court of star chamber; but when he spoke on the occasion, it was in vindication of himself and not in delivering an opinion upon them.¹ It is, however, certain that the arbitrary and irresponsible proceedings of this court and the severity of its sentences have caused its very name to sound odious in our ears; while nothing could be more injurious to the interests of the Church than the fact that the archbishop of Canterbury and other prelates were members of it.

Towards the close of the reign of James I. it was found that Romanist prelates, with a regular staff of priests, were established by the papal power in Ireland, and their jurisdiction was exercised, and their decrees executed, with as much authority as if the papal supremacy had never been questioned. The smallness of the revenue on Charles's accession rendered it difficult for him to keep up his military force, and the Irish Romanists made him offers of assistance on condition that they should be released from taking the oath of supremacy and that some favours should be granted to them. The bishops of the Irish Church declared with much warmth and in a very public manner against toleration to the papists. These, on the other hand, beginning to think themselves of importance to the government, were not satisfied with the exercise of their religion in a quiet and retired manner; they chose to do every thing in as open a way as possible, erecting nunneries and monasteries in various parts of the country, and even performing mass in some churches. The Romanist bishops and priests were of course bound by oath to obedience to the pope, and almost all had been educated in the Spanish seminaries abroad, where they had imbibed a good deal of the Spanish spirit with their education. Although repeated proclamations were issued against the Jesuits and seminary priests, ordering them to depart the country, they were not put in force. Friars appeared openly in their habits, and publicly insulted the archbishop and mayor of Dublin, and became bold enough to excommunicate those who appeared in the bishop's courts. The house of commons had complained that the religion of Rome was openly professed in Ireland, and religious houses were newly erected and maintained in Dublin and other large towns. The Church of Ireland complained greatly of the papist aggressions, so that the lord deputy issued a proclamation forbidding the exercise of Romish rites, and in 1632, pursuant to the king's directions, fifteen of the religious houses were suppressed.

Usher, archbishop of Armagh, who was the primate of Ireland, had

¹ Dean Hook, vol. vi., p. 290—295.

applied to the archbishop of Canterbury to use his influence with the king to induce him to return to the Church those impropriated tithes which had been given to the crown when the monasteries were dissolved, as the incomes of the clergy were so small that it was hardly possible for them to live. Laud prevailed on the king to grant this request. Charles, aware that there was much that required reformation in Church and state in Ireland, hoped to put both on a better footing, and for this purpose he made Sir Thomas Wentworth (afterwards earl of Strafford) lord deputy as well as general of the forces in Ireland with all the necessary powers.¹

It was in the summer of 1633 that Wentworth arrived in Dublin. He found the Romanists a powerful body, and generally ill affected to the English authority. The Church was still in a deplorable state, which was caused by Roman aggression and lay spoliation. The powerful earl of Cork had taken possession of the great tithes of several parishes; but Wentworth caused him to restore them, which was never forgiven by that nobleman. The settlers in Ulster were strong presbyterians; and, when we connect with them the puritan element introduced from England, it will be seen that there was no union at that time amongst those who were opposed to Romanism. Wentworth looked upon Ireland with the eye of a statesman and ruler, and whatever he might be prepared to do to conciliate the Romanists, he was well aware that it was only by the influence of strong English colonies placed amongst them that their rebellious spirit could be held in check. The English interest had increased in the north, south, and east of the country, but Connaught was thoroughly Irish. Old abbeys were still unsuppressed there, the lands of which belonged in law to the crown. The province lay waste, the habits of disorder were universal. A commission was appointed to survey the lands, the greater portion of which was found to belong to the crown; Wentworth, therefore, meditated founding a fresh colony and placing it in Connaught.

The lord deputy commenced an improvement in Dublin by seeking to restore regularity and decency of divine worship in the castle chapel and in the city churches; and after making inquiries respecting the state of the Church and the clergy throughout Ireland, he communicated the result to the archbishop of Canterbury, stating that the clergy were ignorant and unlearned, that the services were performed without order or decency, and that the possessions of the Church were in a great proportion in lay hands. He added that without guides duly qualified to give instruction, or places in which to receive it, it would be as vain to expect to gain or keep the people as it would be for a man to go to war without arms or ammunition. He also complained that the revenues of the schools which had been endowed by king James, and which might have been a means of bringing up the youth of the country in religious and virtuous habits, were misapplied and misused.²

¹ Ormonde, vol. i. p. 50—54. Collier, vol. viii., pp. 33, 46.

² Ormonde, vol. i., p. 61—70. Froude, vol. i., p. 79.

Wentworth's fearless spirit and clear mind were well suited to establish an orderly rule in Ireland; but it was unfortunate that he could not legislate without the Irish parliament, for it was not the voice of a united nation. Some members were elected by the native population, and some by the English colonists. There was no common feeling and no union for a rational object. Wentworth called a parliament in 1634, and by threats and promises obtained the money which he wanted. A well paid and well disciplined army was the result. The thing was well done says the author from whom we quote,¹ but the manner of doing it was not so well, though as matters stood it was perhaps inevitable. The king had offered certain conditions in return for the subsidies, but Wentworth did not fulfil all these; probably thinking it better for Ireland that they should not be fulfilled; but when a government evades its engagements, a bad impression is created. Ireland, however, had never been so prosperous as it became under Wentworth's rule. He was impartial in the administration of justice; if he could be said to lean on any side, it was in favour of the poor. Into whatever errors he may have fallen, the general course of his government was calculated to put the country in a flourishing condition. Romanist aggression and puritan disaffection were checked. Churches and schools were built or repaired; the revenues of the Church were improved by being taken out of the hands of those who had robbed her, and she was in the way of being better supplied with pious and learned clergy. The thirty-nine articles were adopted in the convocation at Dublin, though archbishop Usher had some preference for the Lambeth articles as being more Calvinistic; but he soon agreed with the lord deputy and archbishop Laud, so that there might be no appearance of disunion between the churches of England and Ireland. Incompetent officials were weeded out of the civil and military services. By introducing the cultivation of flax, for which Wentworth saw that many parts of the country were well suited, he laid the foundation of that extensive linen trade which is now so celebrated. He spent even his own private fortune in furthering the work, and sent to Holland for the finest kinds of flax, and to the Netherlands for workmen to give instruction in the manufacture. The value of land improved, commerce and shipping increased, and Ireland might have enjoyed a degree of peace and prosperity which had been hitherto unknown to her, had Wentworth's rule been established for a sufficient length of time. It may be easily believed that the lord deputy made many enemies by these reforms, and his lofty and imperious temper added to the ill will which they occasioned. He could ill brook opposition and would carry things with a high hand when more persuasive means might have accomplished the same ends.²

Wentworth's rule in Ireland was a development of that system known to him and Laud by the word 'thorough.' It meant that

¹ Gardiner.

² Gardiner, ch. v., sec. 4. Ormonde, vol. i., p. 67—86.

office was to be held not to enrich the holder but to benefit the state. The state was set above classes and parties, and above prejudices however deeply rooted, and interests however widely spread. But it grasped at too much ; and whilst improving men's outward condition, it did not sufficiently consider their modes of thinking and their sentiments. In Ireland it aimed at raising the condition of the population to a higher state of civilization,¹ and it is due to the memory of Lord Strafford to record the good he did to Church and state in that nation. The state of things in England, however, caused the lord deputy to be recalled by his sovereign in 1640, and we must now return to affairs in that country.

¹ Gardiner, ch. v., sec. 4.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

CENTURY XVII.

DISTURBANCES IN SCOTLAND. THE LONG PARLIAMENT, A.D. 1640, TO
THE DEATH OF THE KING, A.D. 1649.

THE introduction of the English liturgy into Scotland was not carried out during Charles's visit there in 1633. When the king's proclamation authorizing the use of it was published, signs of discontent arose: some opposed it from prejudice, some from interested motives. The act called the *Surrenders* had been a bitter morsel to those concerned, for though their title to the church lands was most objectionable, yet having secured them, the holders were little inclined to part with their unjust gains. This made them watch every opportunity to embarrass the king's government and distress the Church; and by joining the presbyterian party and pretending that the purity of religion was at stake, they heated the passions of the populace. The archbishop of St. Andrew's and some other of the prelates thought, therefore, that it would be more prudent to delay the introduction of the liturgy for a time, but others urged its being brought forward at once. The exertions which the king had made to recover the possessions of the Church, and the influence which the bishops had acquired by their mild rule since the restoration of episcopal government in the reign of James I., had won over many of the ministers, and had they been left to themselves, the majority would not have taken active steps against the king and the bishops. There was an increasing though still comparatively small party, who loved episcopacy and liturgical forms, and who appealed to the practices of the early Church in support of their views. Such were many of the clergy in the diocese of Aberdeen, and some of the ministers in almost every diocese.¹ On the other hand, some of the Scotch presbyters neither liked a form which resembled that used in England nor the slight alterations which had been made with a view to conciliate national prejudices. It would appear that archbishop Laud has received undeserved blame in this matter, as he had advised the Scotch prelates to act with caution, but as they did not like to discuss the subject in any assembly or convocation of the clergy, the liturgy was introduced without consulting the latter. In the meantime, the disaffected noblemen, assisted by some of the popular ministers, arranged their measures with so much skill and secrecy, that the rejection of the liturgy was rendered certain. On the 16th of July, 1637, notice was given from the pulpits that it would be introduced on the following Sunday, and as no signs of displeasure were then displayed, no precautions were used to

¹ Grub, vol. ii., p. 399.

suppress any adverse movement. But on the 23rd of July, when the service was commenced by the dean in the cathedral in Edinburgh, he was saluted with shouts and execrations, followed by a discharge of Bibles and sticks, and the women, who appear to have received special instructions as to their conduct, rose and threw the stools on which they were sitting at the clergyman. Truly, as the church historian Collier says, "Some people bring their passions to church with them, and quarrel where they ought to have prayed together."

The bishop, who attempted to address the rabble from the pulpit, narrowly escaped with his life. The account given by principal Baillie, who was a presbyterian, says that "when the bishop and his dean in the cathedral, and the bishop of Argyle in the Greyfriars church, began the service, immediately the serving-maids began such a tumult as was never heard of since the Reformation.

Such were the clamours, running and flinging of stones, that a little opposition would have moved the enraged people to have rent sundry of the bishops in pieces." Similar scenes were witnessed in other churches. Women were the principal actors on this occasion. The clergy generally had no share in the secret plans and open violence by which the city was disturbed.

The episcopal establishment under certain modifications had now subsisted in Scotland for more than thirty years. The condition of the parochial ministers had greatly improved by the king's regulations, which had secured for them a fair proportion of the tithes.¹ The rule of the bishops had on the whole been mild and considerate, and irritating controversy had been discouraged, so that the great majority of the incumbents had no wish to raise their voices against the prelates in the coming struggle. It has never been doubted that the multitude on this occasion were incited by the party who afterwards assumed the direction of affairs when the bishops were assailed, and the power of the king set at defiance. The tumult was at first thought to be a mere temporary outbreak, but the truth was, it was the result of a consultation at Edinburgh in April, when Mr. Alexander Henderson and Mr. David Dick, from Fife, and the west country, communicated with lord Balmerinock and the lord advocate, and having obtained their approbation met at the house of Nicholas Balfour, in the Cowgate, where it was decided that several women should give the first affront to the book, and that men should afterwards take up the business.² Another writer says that nothing certain can be known on this point, as the privy council and the magistrates of Edinburgh never made any proper attempt to discover the real authors of the tumult, but this account affords the best explanation of the events that took place.³ Indeed the very absence of due inquiry by the proper authorities would seem to be a confirmation of their connivance in the affair.

¹ Collier, viii., p. 117—121. Russell, ii., p. 131—135.

² See bishop Guthrie's *Memoirs*, quoted in Russell, vol. i., p. 132.

³ Grub, vol. ii., p. 386.

The more violent of the ministers praised the proceedings of the multitude, and the women were held up by them as heroines, but principal Baillie does not applaud their temper. He says, "There never was in our land such a stir. The people think popery is at the doors. The scandalous pamphlets which come daily from England add fuel to this flame. No man may speak any thing in public for the king's party, except he would have himself marked for a sacrifice to be killed some day."¹

The powerful influences which had been at work in this matter soon became manifest, as certain noblemen openly espoused the cause of the populace, and the king was asked to recall the imposition of the canons and the prayer book. During the reign of Charles I., the Scottish nobles were the chief opponents of the sovereign and the Church, and though their power was not so great as it had been during the minority of James I., it was still formidable. Their opposition was greatly increased by the just proceedings taken with regard to the tithes and the maintenance of the clergy, and their ill feeling was aroused still more by their fear of a further restoration of church lands. They looked on the clergy as rivals and dreaded the influence of the bishops in parliament.² At this stage Charles ought to have given an assent to all that was claimed, if he could not compel obedience by a strong hand, but it was ever the case with this unhappy monarch that his concessions came too late. Those whom he had invested with the chief authority in Scotland were unfaithful to him; the Scotch, who attended his court, assured him that all would soon be quiet, and so with a fatal blindness to popular prejudice a fresh proclamation was issued exhorting the use of the liturgy.³

The presbyterian leaders now adopted an expedient by which the co-operation of their whole body might be secured. They divided their members into four committees, or tables, as they were called, above which was a general board whence all orders were issued, while smaller tables or committees were appointed throughout the country. In order to give all their proceedings a religious colouring, and at the same time secure some stronger bond of union amongst their followers, the leaders met at Edinburgh, and drew up the document known as the national covenant. In this deed they were guided by the example which the lords of the congregation had given them when they drew up their bond during the life of the queen-regent. Many persons in all parts of the country were averse to this proceeding, but few had the courage to oppose it, for the Edinburgh committee decided everything, and the royal authority was unable to protect its followers.⁴ It was in March, 1638, that this league was first signed, after having been read aloud in Greyfriars church, Edinburgh. Those who signed were bound to

¹ *Large Declaration*, p. 31, quoted by Russell, vol. ii., p. 137. Grub, vol. ii., p. 393.

² Grub, vol. ii., p. 403.

³ Russell, vol. ii., p. 134—139.

⁴ Grub, vol. iii., p. 2—4. Russell, vol. ii., p. 140.

persevere in the undertaking they had entered upon, and to defend one another under all circumstances and against all persons. The principal articles of the covenant consisted of a renunciation of popery and a resistance to all innovations in religious matters, and a mutual defence from all oppression and violence, and all was declared to be done for the glory of God, the honour of the king, and the advantage of their country. It was, however, evident that whilst they professed loyalty, rebellion was meditated. In fact the insincerity with which the covenanters are chargeable appears most frequently with regard to their professions of loyalty to the king. The covenant was signed with great zeal in Edinburgh and the surrounding districts, but was more coldly received in the remoter parts, especially at Aberdeen. When arguments failed to induce the clergy and people to sign the covenant, threats and violence were used. Many parochial ministers objected to sign it, and so were deprived of their benefices and severely censured, their places being filled by presbyterians from Ireland.

The covenanters soon began to demand a parliament and an assembly, and the king was at last induced to cancel the order for introducing the canons and liturgy, to abolish the court of high commission which had been introduced into Scotland, and to suspend the articles of Perth. Charles appointed the marquis of Hamilton as his commissioner in Scotland. This nobleman, though the deputy of the sovereign, met with no respect, and when he suggested as a preliminary that the insurgent nobles should cease to acknowledge the obligations of the covenant, they replied that they would sooner "renounce their baptism than the covenant." These nobles also, on finding that divine service would be performed in the chapel royal at Holyrood according to the ritual of the English Church, practised there during a period of twenty years, declared "that the person who should dare to read prayers, should never read more; and that a thousand men were ready to prevent it."¹ The marquis was authorized to summon an assembly to be held at Glasgow in November, and a parliament in the following summer. The king proposed two conditions for regulating the proceedings of the assembly; first, that the members deputed by the presbyterians should be elected solely by their brethren the clergy, and not by a mixture of lay votes; second, that the assembly should not interfere with any laws or institutions which belonged to the province of the legislature. The confederated noblemen objected to these reasonable conditions, and being aware that the majority of the clergy were opposed to the sweeping changes which they desired, they made arrangements by which the laity had so large an influence, that the majority of those returned to the assembly were devoted to the covenant.

The covenanters wished to deprive the bishops of their seats at the council board, and for this purpose adopted an expedient which

¹ See the *Large Declaration*, p. 88—109, quoted by Russell, vol. ii., p. 147. Grub, vol. iii., p. 10.

was repeatedly used by them during their contest with the crown, with regard not only to the prelates, but to any other persons from whom they expected or encountered opposition. They commenced an attack upon their character, charging them with grievous offences, and requiring that they should be deposed from their offices, until the charges should be considered and proofs given of their guilt.

The lords of the covenant, having obtained a majority in the assembly by means of their personal influence and the activity of their agents, devised a scheme for expelling the bishops from it; but to this the commissioner refused to agree. They then induced the presbytery of Edinburgh to cite the prelates to appear before them, by what Burnet calls the "most scandalous summons that was ever heard of in the Christian Church,"¹ as it charged the bishops with heresy, simony, perjury, adultery, and breach of the sabbath; to which were added suspicion of popery. The citation was directed to be read in all the churches in Edinburgh, but the marquis of Hamilton sent orders to forbid this being done. It was read notwithstanding, and by this unjustifiable step the ministers of Edinburgh showed themselves to be the partisans of an unreasonable faction. The covenant was now carried out with so high a hand that none ventured to resist, though the concessions which the king had made had been received with satisfaction in many parts of Scotland. The bishops by a regular deed declined the authority of the assembly, both on account of the unconstitutional interference which had taken place in the mode of electing the members, and the seditious character of the members themselves. Several protests were produced at its meeting, but neither they nor the bishops' deed were permitted to be read; and the king's commissioner, finding all his efforts vain, and that no respect was paid to his wishes or authority, discharged the assembly by proclamation at the market cross.

The lords of the covenant were prepared with a protest against this, and expressed their resolution to continue their labours till the objects for which the assembly had been convened were accomplished. The several assemblies by which episcopacy had been sanctioned were accordingly condemned, and the ministers released from the oaths which they had taken to their bishops; the two archbishops and the greater number of the bishops were deposed and excommunicated, and the remainder were degraded. An act was also passed prohibiting churchmen from holding civil place and power, but the covenanting clergy exempted themselves from its operation, as the moderator of this assembly, Alexander Henderson, engaged deeply in politics, and accompanied the Scotch army to the English borders in the following year, when he signed an armistice as one of the public commissioners. The cause of the covenanters had been much aided by the publication of books and pamphlets, but they resolved not to allow this instrument to be

¹ See Burnet's *Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton*, p. 88, quoted by Russell, vol. ii., p. 156.

directed against themselves; they therefore passed a resolution, by which no books or pamphlets respecting the acts of the assembly or the affairs of the kirk were to be printed, neither "any protestations, or any reasons for or against the controversies of this time," without a warrant under the hand of their clerk. This celebrated assembly also passed an act providing that none be chosen to sit in provincial or general assemblies but those who subscribed the covenant; from all which it is evident that they allowed no freedom of conscience to others, nor had they sufficient confidence in the goodness of their cause to allow arguments to be employed against it by their opponents. Thus episcopacy, the canons, and the liturgy were abolished, and the covenant was ordered under pain of excommunication to be signed by every one.¹

Most of the bishops retired from Scotland. Archbishop Spotswood, who had fled to the English court, died in 1639; Lindsay, archbishop of Glasgow, ended his troubled life at Newcastle; and the other prelates descended to their graves without having obtained permission to return to their native country. Three only, the bishops of Dunkeld, Orkney, and Argyle, submitted to the ruling powers, and accepted parochial charges as presbyterian ministers "not respected by either side." But as these prelates were admitted to the ministerial office by the covenanters, it would appear that their submission to the assembly had cleared their characters of all the foul crimes of which, when bishops, they had been accused.²

The accusations which were brought against the Scottish bishops formed one of the most disgraceful proceedings of which the chiefs of the covenant were guilty, and it was deliberately carried through. They knew that the people generally would make no distinction whether the prelates were guilty of one or all of the charges, and did not intend that they should do so. The covenanting chiefs were resolved to prevent freedom of debate in the general assembly of 1638, and did not conceal their resolution. They had taken steps, even before it was summoned, to secure the return of such members as were devoted to their party. Had the assembly met at Aberdeen it would have given many advantages to the royal cause, but Glasgow was decided on, probably by the advice of the marquis of Hamilton, who depended too much on the influence of his estates in that neighbourhood. Its acts were dictated by a few individuals who had arranged all beforehand. Their ability and management was undoubted, but the manner in which these talents were exercised and the ends to which they were directed deprive them of all credit.³

It is apparent that this ecclesiastical revolution was brought about almost entirely by lay influence, the chief motives being envy and fear on the part of the nobles—envy at seeing the pre-

¹ Russell, vol. ii., p. 140—171.

² Russell, vol. ii., p. 190.

³ Grub, vol. iii., p. 26—31. See also ch. liii.

lates and higher clergy placed in offices of trust, and fear that the king would restore to the bishops' sees a portion of the estates of which they had been deprived at the Reformation. And as the majority of the clergy were still in favour of a limited episcopacy, both force and fraud were employed to return those only to the assembly who were devoted to the covenanting party; whilst in order to deprive the prelates of their votes they were accused of crimes which were not even attempted to be proved, and finally the acts which changed the church constitution were passed after the assembly had been dissolved by the marquis of Hamilton, the king's commissioner. The members of this noted assembly of 1638 at Glasgow appeared rather as the delegates of a factious aristocracy than as the deputies of their brethren, the parochial ministers of the nation.¹

It is true that the manner in which the canons and liturgy were introduced, and the time chosen for doing so, were extremely ill-advised. In the state of political feeling, and where ignorance and prejudice so largely prevailed, it is not surprising that the populace in Scotland were worked up to the commission of riotous acts, and that disorder rapidly spread. The king by his imprudent and arbitrary proceedings gave an impetus to those seditious feelings, and the Scottish covenanters being in close alliance with their friends in England, and ready to push matters to extremities, prepared for war. There were a great many old soldiers in Scotland who had served in Germany during the thirty years' war, and therefore, although the country had not been engaged in hostilities for many years, she possessed a veteran force. In 1639, the Scots proceeded in arms to the border, commanded by general Lesley, and accompanied by several of the presbyterian clergy. At the door of each captain's tent was a flag with the arms of Scotland, and these words, "For Christ's crown and covenant." Sermons were delivered, and the hearers were assured that they had been conducted hitherto by a divine hand.

The covenanters had entered into some negotiations with France, and the French government, under cardinal Richelieu, was very willing to perplex Charles by encouraging disaffection amongst his subjects. The king raised an army to meet the Scottish insurgents, and the lord-deputy Wentworth sent to his assistance a well appointed regiment of five hundred men from Ireland. Hostilities, however, were not commenced, as a treaty was entered into; and though the king did not ratify the proceedings of the Glasgow assembly, he consented that a general assembly should be held at Edinburgh in August, and a parliament soon afterwards,² which met accordingly, but in 1640 war was again resolved upon, and the puritan party in England encouraged the Scotch, whom they now looked upon as useful allies in the struggle which was approaching between themselves and their sovereign. The Scotch

¹ Russell, vol. ii., p. 173.

² Russell, vol. ii., p. 208.

had kept their forces together, and the king, seeing the impending storm, sent for Wentworth, upon whose judgment and fidelity he greatly relied, and after declaring him lord-lieutenant of Ireland, he created him earl of Strafford.

The king was now advised by Strafford, Laud, and others, to call a parliament, which met in April, 1640; but the commons made fresh demands as to religion, and were in no humour to vote supplies. No agreement could be come to, and the short parliament, as it was afterwards called, was dissolved after sitting for twenty-three days. This dissolution did not improve the temper of the people, and though English puritanism and Scotch presbyterianism were not quite the same thing, they were rapidly approaching to a good understanding with one another.

The Scots crossed the border in the summer, and seized Durham and Newcastle; the king had marched to York to meet them, funds having been raised by a subscription, which was headed by Strafford, whose example was followed by the great officers of state and most of the nobility and gentry, who were of the king's party. Strafford, who possessed more vigour and determination than Charles, had advised a battle, as defeat would not place the king in a worse position than inactivity, and an army had been collected in the north of Ireland, under the command of the earl of Ormonde, which was ready to come into Scotland. But Charles's fatal indecision induced him to listen to other counsels, and it was found that some of the officers and sentinels in the royal army were not inclined to fight the Scots, being either enemies to Strafford or favourers of the covenant. A treaty was, therefore, entered into, the chief articles of which were to be settled in London. The counties of Northumberland and Durham were left in the hands of the Scots, as a pledge for the payment of their expenses, which were placed at the rate of £850 per day during their stay in England.¹

Convocation continued to sit in London after the short parliament was dissolved, which was not a usual practice, though there had been a precedent for it in the reign of queen Elizabeth. They therefore voted their subsidies to the crown, and added to and altered some of the canons. One for suppressing the growth of popery was brought in by archbishop Laud, and another was introduced against Socinianism, which was on the increase. This sect took its name from two Italians, named Socinus, who lived during the sixteenth century. It was a revival of the old Arian heresy, and was closely connected with Unitarianism, which sprang up in Switzerland early in the Reformation period, and for which Servetus was burnt at Geneva in 1553. These sects revived the ancient heresies respecting the divine nature of the second and third persons of the Trinity, and were very common amongst the puritans of the seventeenth century. One of the canons passed by this convocation carried the royal authority to a great height, and declared for

¹ Gardiner, ch. vi., sec. 2. Ormonde, vol. i., p. 91.

passive obedience; another enjoined an oath for preventing innovations in church doctrine and government; but these were loudly declaimed against, especially in the next parliament. The last canon, which was intended as an antidote to the Scottish covenant, was known by the name of the *et cetera* oath. During the time convocation was sitting, the archbishop's house at Lambeth was attacked by a mob of five hundred persons, who being forced to retire proposed assaulting the members of convocation; but the king sent a guard to protect them.¹

In November, 1640, another parliament was summoned; this was the one known as the long parliament. The opening speeches showed the feeling which existed against the crown and the Church. One of its earliest acts was to appoint a committee of religion, which afterwards branched off into several sub-committees, one of which was called "The committee for providing preaching ministers, and removing scandalous ones." The effect of these committees was to oppress the clergy and bring them to disrepute: their proceedings will be alluded to at a later period. Charles required supplies, but the commons were in no hurry to provide funds to pay the Scotch army, and were in no anxiety to induce their Scotch friends to return home. The earl of Strafford, who was in command of the king's troops, was urged by Charles to come to London, as his advice was required at the council board. That nobleman, knowing the bitterness and strength of his opponents, was aware of his danger; and came, though against the advice of his friends. Their apprehensions were too well founded. The house of commons both feared and hated him, and the puritan party had never forgiven him for having joined the councils of the king. He was impeached upon the charge of high treason, the motion being brought forward by Pym, who at once took the lead in the house. The charge was conveyed to the house of lords, as Strafford was entering the chamber, and he left it as a prisoner.

The army in Ireland had now been nearly disbanded, and when the parliament met in Dublin in October, both Romanists and puritans united their strength to ruin Strafford, whose acts, though really beneficial to their country, they complained of as grievances. They were encouraged in their ill-will by the success of the Scotch, and the increasing discontent in England. They accordingly prepared a remonstrance, and sent it to England by a committee composed of puritans and Romanists, both of which parties Strafford had held in check, and thereby incurred their hatred. This remonstrance served to encourage the clamour against the earl, and to raise a belief in his guilt before he was brought to trial.²

In March, 1641, the trial of lord Strafford began in Westminster Hall, but as the commons found that high treason could not be proved, and that the house of lords hesitated as to the legality

¹ Blunt's *King*, p. 163. Collier, vol. viii., p. 183.

² Ormonde, vol. i., p. 105—114.

of the proceedings, they substituted a bill of attainder. An impeachment required the house of lords to act as judges and to decide according to legal rules. A bill of attainder, if it passed both houses and was accepted by the king, required no reasons to be given. The latter course was therefore adopted, and the bill passed both houses in May. The commons condemned the earl to death; the peers, who were opposed to this, were threatened by the mob, and only twenty-six out of eighty who were present at the trial voted for that sentence. The populace flocked to Whitehall clamouring for the royal assent. Juxon, bishop of London, advised Charles if in his conscience he disapproved the bill, by no means to assent to it; but Strafford wrote requesting his sovereign for the sake of the public peace to permit his unfortunate though innocent life to be taken.¹ After much anxiety and many doubts the king granted a commission to pass the bill of attainder, and thus committed the great mistake and sin of his life—Strafford was condemned to be beheaded.

In the mean time archbishop Laud had been committed to the Tower, and Strafford, not being permitted to see him, sent him a message through archbishop Usher, the Irish primate, requesting him to be at his window, as he passed to execution the following morning, to give him his blessing, and added, "Desire the archbishop to aid me by his prayers this night." Accordingly, when the earl passed, he saw the venerable prelate and said, "My lord, I ask your prayers and your blessing," upon which, greatly agitated, the archbishop lifted up his hands in the act of blessing, and though too much overcome to pronounce the words, he caught the last touching words of Strafford, "Farewell, my lord. May God protect your innocency." In his speech upon the scaffold, the earl declared that he had always wished to further the interests of the king and his subjects, and he prayed God to forgive his enemies, stating that he died a true son of the Church of England, and that he prayed for its peace. Usher was informed by Strafford that an offer had been made to him, that if he would employ his power with the king for the abolition of episcopacy, his life should be saved, but he had replied that he would not purchase his life at so dear a rate. Thus on May 12, 1641, fell this great statesman, whose loyalty and patriotism were undoubted; while with regard to his rule in Ireland, an illustrious historian of the present century says,² "The government of Ireland had scarcely passed into the hands of Strafford, ere that kingdom, which till then had been only a trouble and expense to the crown, became a source of riches and strength . . . the nobles were no longer allowed to oppress the people with impunity, or the aristocratic and religious factions to tear each other to pieces. . . In short, Ireland was governed

¹ It has been asserted that this letter was not written by Strafford, but was a forgery of his enemies, sent to the king to induce him to consent to his death. See Carte's *Life of Ormonde*, vol. i., p. 137.

² Guizot's *History of the English Revolution*, quoted by dean Hook in *Lives of the Archbishops*, vol. vi., p. 259.

arbitrarily, harshly . . . but yet to the interest of general civilization . . . instead of being as formerly a prey to the greedy extortion of revenue officers, and to the domination of a selfish and ignorant aristocracy." To the king the loss was very great, and strong compunction for his assent to the execution of his unfortunate minister attended Charles during the remainder of his life.¹

The civil war may almost be said to have begun with this unhappy event. With the Scottish army in the background, the supremacy of the commons was rapidly being established. The main error of Charles's government in England and Scotland was, that he never yielded to the wishes or demands of the commons in either country until resistance was of no avail. His commands bore a high tone of authority, whilst his measures showed indecision. The royal assent was now obtained to the election of a parliament once in three years, even if the crown did not summon one, and in May the king agreed that the existing parliament should not be dissolved without its consent, which rendered the house of commons independent of all other power, and caused its supremacy to be thoroughly established. An end was happily put to the star chamber and high commission courts, and tonnage and poundage were no more to be levied without consent of parliament. In August the treaty with the Scotch was signed, and after the money had been duly paid, their army recrossed the border, and returned to their own country.

Much had now been done to curtail the arbitrary powers of the crown, and for its exertions in this respect we owe a debt of gratitude to the long parliament, but its success in securing civil liberty must not blind us to the tyranny which it succeeded in establishing over ecclesiastical affairs. The puritans were resolved to overturn the Church of England, and to allow no tolerance to any religious opinions other than the narrowest form of Calvinism. They had laboured for this during the reign of Elizabeth, but that farsighted queen perceived that it was not toleration which they demanded, but the subjugation of the Church; she was aware that their principles were hostile to monarchy, and with regard to their sentiments on the doctrines of election and predestination, she said, "They were men who were over-bold with the Almighty, making too many scannings of his blessed will as lawyers did with human testaments." Archbishop Parker observed, "They are ambitious spirits, and can abide no superiority. . . . Those which labour to reign in men's consciences will, if they may bring their purposes to pass, bring a heavy yoke upon their necks . . . The end will be confusion to religion and ruin to our country."² These words were now about to be fulfilled. If Charles could have made up his mind to abolish episcopacy and endure puritanism in England, it is possible that the commons might have still acknow-

¹ Dean Hook, vol. vi., p. 340. Gardiner, ch. vi., sec. 3. Collier, vol. viii., p. 205.

² Southey, p. 413.

ledged him as their king; but with all his faults as a sovereign, his religious feelings were strong and sincere, and the Church of England may justly number Charles I. amongst her martyrs.

The king being anxious to disarm the resentment of his native subjects, visited Scotland in August, 1641, when he fulfilled the promises which had been made to the Scotch commissioners in London during the previous year. The acts which had established presbyterianism in that kingdom were ratified, and the use of the liturgy was suspended; Alexander Henderson became one of the king's chaplains, the earl of Argyle was made a marquis, and general Lesley was created earl of Leven. The ruling party expressed their gratitude, and renewed an old statute denouncing it treason for any of the Scottish nation to raise an army without the king's commission. The more moderate presbyterians were indeed satisfied with the king's concessions, but there were others whose views were far more extensive, and who insinuated into the popular mind the idea that this reformation must be extended over the whole island. The above proceedings did, in fact, give great encouragement to the puritan party in England, who did not doubt that they also could bring the king to the same point.¹

Whilst Charles was in the North, a rebellion broke out in Ireland. Two parties in that country, each possessing great influence amongst the people, were highly dissatisfied—the Romish clergy and the old Irish septs; and now that there was no resident lord-lieutenant and the army was disbanded, the moment for rising seemed to them to have arrived. The English colonists were a grievance to the natives; it was true that they promoted peace and order in Ireland, but what was that to the chiefs of the old race? The reformed Irish Church, and the presbyterians and puritans were alike hateful to the Irish Romanists; it was true that they were able to exercise their religion in peace, but the priests possessed only a scanty and uncertain subsistence, and the only way in which they could hope for benefit was by force of arms. The native Irish considered the Scotch and English settlers as their enemies. But the Anglo-Normans of the pale, though Romanists, had not forgotten their connection with England; and with the barons of the pale the king was in communication. The chosen general of the army, which had been disbanded, was the earl of Ormonde, a member of the Anglican Church; and most of the English families who had settled in the south were royalists.

For some time there had been uneasy signs in Ireland. Old soldiers who had served in the long war on the continent were coming back; friars and priests were also returning. The members of the Irish house of commons were bitter against lord Strafford, and people began to clamour for self-government and the dismissal of English garrisons. Some uneasiness was felt at the number of disbanded soldiers who were at large and in idleness. The natural chief of the native Irish at this time was the nephew

¹ Russell, vol. ii., p. 217. Collier vol. viii., p. 224.

of the earl of Tyrone, but he was in Flanders, and the command fell on his cousin, Sir Phelim O'Neill. One of the Romanist bishops directed the enterprise. The wild weather which often prevailed towards the fall of the year rendered the communication with England uncertain; moreover, the war between the king and the English parliament was about to break out, and neither side would have time to attend to Ireland; in short, England's difficulty was Ireland's opportunity. A day was appointed for a general rising, Dublin castle was to be seized, the forts and garrisons throughout the country to be surprised and taken, and in the north the Irish people were to dispose of the English settlers. In Dublin, the enterprise was happily discovered on the eve of its execution, but other parts of the country were not so fortunate, and on the 23rd of October, 1641, commenced that fearful massacre which Irish Romanists have vainly tried to excuse. The slaughter in cold blood of men, women, and children, and the atrocities committed during the period, fill the mind with horror. They laid the foundation of that bitter feeling between Romanist and protestant, Irish and English, which existed for a century and a half afterwards.¹

The long parliament soon showed that it was resolved to overturn the ecclesiastical establishment of the Church of England, and after complaining of the appointment to five vacant bishoprics by the crown, and of canons having been passed without consent of parliament, though no other practice had ever been followed, the commons required the house of peers to deprive the bishops of their seats in parliament. The peers would not then agree to this, but petitions against episcopacy were got up, the populace flocked towards Westminster and insulted the prelates and such of the peers as adhered to the king. The former being distinguished by their dress were exposed to many insults, and this state of popular feeling has been described by a satirical poet of the seventeenth century:—

“ And thus all cries about the town,
Join throats to cry the bishops down.
The oyster-women locked their fish up,
And trudged away to cry, ‘ No bishop.’
Patchers left old clothes in the lurch,
And fell to turn and patch the Church.”

BUTLER.

The prelates who were in London protested against the treatment they received, which obliged them to absent themselves from the house of peers, and they also protested against the votes which should pass during their absence. The commons impeached them of high treason for thus protesting, and as no one ventured to vindicate them, they were committed to the Tower, where they remained for five months, till the peers set them at liberty on bail. The root and branch bill, as it was called, for the entire abolition of bishops in the Church, was now pushed on by the commons. A

¹ Froude's *English in Ireland*, b. i., ch. ii.

moderate party, amongst whom were lord Falkland and Edward Hyde (the future great historian and lord chancellor Clarendon), wished to effect a compromise, but things had come to such a pass that compromise was impossible.

The commons now prepared *The Grand Remonstrance*, which was a complaint of Charles's conduct from the beginning of his reign, and in fact amounted to a vote of want of confidence in the king. The debate was long and stormy, and the remonstrance was carried by a majority of only eleven. It was then moved that it should be printed, which the moderate party protested against. It was presented to the king, and in December it was printed, in order that it might be circulated through the country. A great portion of it related to the Church, and the king was requested to consent to such a "reformation" of the church government and liturgy as parliament should advise, that there should be a maintenance for "preaching ministers" throughout the kingdom, and that his majesty would consent to laws for taking away innovations, superstitions, and "scandalous ministers." This last expression we shall hereafter find frequently mentioned, and it will be seen that it comprised all whose religious opinions did not coincide with those of the majority in parliament. Not a few petitions were presented to the king and both houses of parliament in behalf of episcopacy and the Book of Common Prayer. The commons were willing to receive petitions from those who favoured their views, but discouraged all who favoured the Church or monarchy, and many persons were imprisoned or persecuted as "delinquents," a term which had lately come into use, to describe those who upheld the Church and king.

In January, 1642, Charles committed one of the most injudicious and impolitic acts of his reign. Having discovered that six of the leaders of the opposite party had been in communication with the Scots during their late insurrection, he sent his attorney-general to impeach them before the house of peers. These leaders were lord Kimbolton, in the lords, and Pym, Hampden, Hazlerig, Holles, and Strode, in the commons. The commons would not give their members up, and Charles's attempt to seize them on the following day was fruitless. He might have foreseen this result, for all power was now in the hands of that house. The tumults consequent upon this attempt to coerce parliament and the popular feelings which it aroused obliged the king to leave his palace at Whitehall. The accused members took refuge in the city, where the commons followed, and sat as a committee at the Guildhall, but they soon returned in triumph to Westminster. The real struggle was now to commence. There was no standing army in England, but there was a militia composed of citizen soldiers, of which the officers had been hitherto named by the king. The nomination was now claimed by parliament.¹

About this time the two great parties in the state began to be

¹ Gardiner, ch. vi., sec. 4, 5. Collier, vol. viii., p. 235—250.

known by the names of cavaliers and roundheads; the royalists received the former name from their gallant bearing and skill in horsemanship; the parliamentarians derived their cognomen from their short or cropped hair, which was the puritan fashion. The king's army was chiefly composed of the nobles and gentry with their retainers, and for aid in money he depended mostly upon the loyalty of his cavaliers, who responded liberally to the call. A few of the peers and most of the merchants and shopkeepers were on the other side. The parliamentary party was in possession of the metropolis, and of the magazines of arms and ammunition. In August of this year the royal standard was set up at Nottingham. The king commanded his troops in person, and established his headquarters at Oxford, which ancient university has at all times been distinguished for its loyalty. The earl of Essex had been appointed by parliament as its commander-in-chief. The first battle was fought at Edgehill in October, where prince Rupert, the son of Elizabeth and the elector palatine, drove all before him with his dashing cavalry; but the king's infantry were not equally successful, and the results were indecisive.

Queen Henrietta Maria had escaped to Holland; her influence over the king had been considerable, and was not exercised for his or the country's advantage. She had become extremely unpopular through her religious and political views.

We must as much as possible confine ourselves to such events as are connected with church history during these unhappy times. The year 1643 passed on without any decided success on either side, and we mention the first battle of Newbury only because it was rendered memorable by the death of the great and good lord Falkland. His natural cheerfulness had become clouded; he was weary of civil war, and frequently uttered the words, "Peace! peace!" His personal bravery was conspicuous, and while fighting for his sovereign at Newbury, he was mortally wounded. The compromise and moderation he sighed for were still in the distant future; the present was occupied by intolerance and war.

A bill abolishing episcopacy had passed the house of commons in September, 1642, and early in 1643 parliament had passed a bill to sequester the estates of the bishops and other delinquents, by which expression they meant those who had declared for the king. Thus the rents and profits of the different sees and cathedral chapters that lay within reach of their troops were seized, and the livings of the clergy were likewise sequestered for various reasons, as we shall presently see. Most of the silenced lecturers, and other preachers who had left the kingdom within the last ten years, now returned, and were put into the vacant benefices. The king published a proclamation against these proceedings; but though it showed his desire to protect the loyal clergy, it had no effect in stopping the persecution. Convocation was not sitting, the times being too disturbed for it to meet. An ordinance was passed by parliament, calling together an assembly of learned, godly, and judicious divines for settling the government and liturgy of the

Church of England, that it might be nearer "in agreement with the Church of Scotland and other reformed churches abroad." On the first of July the assembly met at Westminster, and after requesting that a solemn fast might be held, they made various suggestions to parliament, and desired "that there may be a thorough and speedy proceeding against blind guides and scandalous ministers," and that "justice may be executed on all delinquents"—all of which were promised to be taken into speedy consideration. They proceeded to draw up a directory for public worship, which was afterwards ordered to be used by all the churches within the kingdom. The creed and ten commandments were not inserted in the directory, the question of their insertion having been debated in the house of commons and negatived. The forms for matrimony and the visitation for the sick were mostly left to the minister's discretion, and the dead were to be buried without any prayers or religious ceremony.¹

Military affairs were not progressing as parliament wished, and the help of the Scots was much desired; in fact, the successes of the royalists in England in the beginning of the war were such that the rebellion might have been extinguished if the Scots had not taken a part in the contest. Charles had attempted to preserve their good will by his concessions, but the real authority in Scotland was in the hands of the covenanters,² whom no concessions could appease.

In August, 1643, the general assembly met at Edinburgh, and Henderson was for the third time chosen moderator. After much discussion a document was drawn up and agreed to by the assembly, which bore the celebrated title of *A solemn League and Covenant for Reformation and Defence of Religion, &c.* It set forth that every endeavour should be made to bring the churches in the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, to the nearest uniformity in religion, form of church government, directory for worship, &c., and that in like manner, without respect of persons, every endeavour must be made to root out popery, prelacy, &c., and to disown and punish all incendiaries and malignants, and to assist all who should enter into the league and covenant. The directory for public worship named in the covenant began with a preface, which stated that the Book of Common Prayer had become an offence, not only to many of the godly at home, but also to the reformed churches abroad, in consequence of which it was necessary to substitute the directory in its place.

It will be remembered that while the contest between the queen-regent, Mary of Guise, and the congregation was undecided, the Book of Common Prayer was used by many, but when the presbyterians had gained the upper hand, it was gradually superseded by the book called the Order of Geneva, which was originally compiled at that place, while Knox was the minister there. To prevent

¹ Collier, vol. viii., p. 251—260, and p. 287—290.

² Grub, vol. iii., p. 92.

superstition, neither singing nor reading were allowed at burials, but the bodies of the dead were to be decently interred without any ceremony.¹ There was no distinction of seasons. Sunday alone was to be observed. Other holy days were discontinued; even the great feasts of Christmas and Easter were no longer permitted to be observed.

By the solemn league and covenant now put forward all the formularies previously in use in Scotland were to be superseded. The creed in the ordinary service, and the Gloria Patri at the end of the Psalms, were now abandoned. The change which it was proposed to introduce in England comprised the abolition of the ancient episcopate, services, and ritual, which had been preserved and purified by the Reformation. "They, who now sought to abolish these offices," says our author, "were as ignorant of their history and real meaning as they were incapable of appreciating their beauty." Copies of the covenant were sent into all parts of Scotland, with an order that it should be read and explained on the first Sunday after receiving it, and that the following Sunday it should be sworn to by every man and woman, and signed by all who could write, under severe penalties.²

The covenant was read by one of the Scotch commissioners, in the pulpit of St. Margaret's church, Westminster, in September, 1643, before parliament and the assembly of divines, and afterwards signed by these parties respectively; the city of London and the army quartered there also taking this test. Some of the Scotch commissioners were given a share in the administration, while some of the ruling elders of the kirk sat at Westminster with the assembly of divines. A hundred thousand pounds were advanced to the Scotch, and towards the close of the year the covenanting army entered England.

The taking of the covenant was now pressed upon all that part of the country which was under the influence of parliament, and it became an instrument for the further persecution of the loyal clergy. Those who refused to comply were turned out of their houses, and were forced to retire to places under the king's protection. Their position and benefices were occupied either by those who had been deprived for nonconformity in previous years, or by presbyterians who had formerly been lecturers; to which may be added a few persons from Scotland and New England, who came in for a share of preferment. Some of the puritans who had formerly declaimed against pluralities, were now reconciled to holding two or three livings. Those clergy who refused to join the rebellion or to revolt from the Church were sequestered and imprisoned, harassed and undone in every way; and from the year 1641 to 1647, a vast number of clergymen were turned out of their livings in the metropolis alone, and their wives and families sent adrift in the streets. This may give

¹ It will thus be observed that "silent burials" had been introduced by Knox and his followers, and were afterwards approved by the puritan party in England.

² Grub, vol. iii., p. 95—106; also vol. ii., pp. 96, 99.

some idea of the persecution carried on in other cities, and in country districts. Besides the test of the covenant, another method was employed to reach the objecting clergy in various parts by the adoption of the term 'scandalous ministers,' but the scandals alleged against them were left unproved; and lastly, they were turned out as malignants, which meant being true to their allegiance to their sovereign. A "committee for plundered ministers" was formed, which was intended to provide alike for those who had suffered by his majesty's troops or for their adherence to parliament.¹

The sect of the congregationalists or independents was now coming into notice, some members of the Westminster assembly being of that persuasion. It has been mentioned that they had gone into Holland some years before, and there formed their system of church government, which is entirely democratic. Ordination seemed to be considered by the independents a mere appointment on the part of the congregation of one person who should officiate in public, and every teacher might assemble a congregation wherever he pleased, and every congregation so formed was deemed a church with the authority of discipline vested in itself, even excommunication being regulated by the vote of the majority. The prospect of affairs in England becoming more encouraging, the independents returned to their own country, where they gathered congregations together and increased in numbers. The presbyterians looked upon this as an encroachment, and, complaining that their flocks became unsettled, required the independents to give up their singularities and join them, but the independents refused to be over-ruled and demanded toleration. As they gradually increased, they became anxious to have a common bond of union without destroying the independence of each church or congregation, which constitutes their peculiar tenet. They accomplished this object in 1568, when they published their declaration of faith, which was drawn up much on the plan of the confession of faith of the Westminster divines.²

The difference between the presbyterians and the independents, and both from the Church, may be shortly put thus:—The Church holds that the Christian society, so named in Scripture, was founded by our Saviour; that he appointed twelve apostles who should minister therein, upon whom the Holy Ghost descended at Pentecost; that the apostles thus inspired had ordained three orders of ministers—bishops, priests, and deacons, in whom were continued the authority which our Lord had given to them; and for fifteen hundred years it was held that the government of the Church and the continued ordination of the ministry were committed to the chief of these three orders—the bishops, and that those who desired salvation should enter this Church by baptism and continue in its unity.

¹ Collier, vol. viii., p. 261—269.

² Collier, vol. viii., p. 271. Bishop Short, p. 463.

The presbyterians admitted the divine authority of the ministry, but held that the authority resided in the presbyters, and that the bishops were of no higher order, though for convenience they might be appointed to perform certain functions and to preside over the rest.

The independents held the exactly opposite opinions, that any number of Christian men might form a church, which should elect its ministers and settle all questions of faith, discipline, and membership, and that, each church or congregation being independent of others and complete in itself, all questions were to be settled by its members. Hence the term independents or congregationalists. In political principles they were republicans.

Archbishop Laud had been three years in prison, his estate had been sequestered, and he was now impeached of high treason. The trial commenced in March. Prynne, whose libels we have previously mentioned, was employed to obtain evidence against him. The archbishop, in his defence before the house of lords, complained that the papers which had been prepared for his defence had been taken from his room by Prynne, that his diary and book of prayers were taken away and used against him, that his registers and the books of the council table, &c., had been inspected for matter against him, and that he had been denied the perusal of these records. His trial had been protracted, and the Scotch required that the proceedings should be carried on more quickly; but the impossibility of finding him guilty of high treason caused him to be frequently remanded without any conclusion being arrived at. Laud, supported by the consciousness of innocence, vindicated his conduct against every charge with consummate ability and intrepid bearing. Every detail of his long life was brought forward, from his entering Oxford to his committal to the tower; his private diary, meant for no eye but his own, was printed. At first a garbled and mutilated copy, to which Prynne had added comments, was put into the hands of the peers, who were to try him; but the genuine diary was afterwards published, by which Prynne's proceedings with regard to it were exposed. The archbishop's accusers descended to the most trifling actions of his life; every personal infirmity, every indiscreet word or deed that could be remembered, was brought forward and aggravated, and the best actions of his life treated as crimes. The charge of endeavouring to reconcile the churches of England and Rome roused him to an animated defence. "I have converted several from popery," he said, "I have taken an oath against it, I have held a controversy against it, I have been in danger of my life from a popish plot." With regard to the seizure of his diary and his private prayers, he "blessed God there was no disloyalty in the one, nor popery in the other."

No charge of high treason could be proved against him, and the few peers who were present at his trial (for it must be remembered that very few now attended the meetings of the house) felt that it was impossible to convict him of it. In November, 1664, the

commons desired that Laud should be brought to their bar. This was not in accordance with the laws of the constitution, for as a spiritual peer it was to the house of peers alone that he had to answer, and the proceedings of the commons throughout were extremely irregular. The archbishop was not allowed counsel, but was permitted to speak for himself, and the following was the concluding portion of his address:—"Mr. Speaker, I am very aged, and the period of my life in the course of nature cannot be far off. It cannot but be a great grief to me to stand at these years thus charged before you; whatsoever errors or faults I may have committed by the way, in any of my proceedings through human infirmity (as who is he that hath not offended and broken some statute laws too, by ignorance, or misapprehension, or forgetfulness at some sudden time of action?) yet, if God bless me with so much memory, I will die with these words in my mouth, that I never intended, much less endeavoured, the subversion of the laws of the kingdom, nor the bringing in of popish superstition upon the true protestant religion established by law in this land."

In December, the archbishop's case was again brought before the lords, fourteen peers only being present. The judges, who were consulted as to whether the actions he was accused of were treasonable, declared that they were not so by any known and established law of the land. A message was sent from the commons telling the peers "they would do well to agree or else the multitude would come and force them to it." At length the attainder was ratified, and sentence of death passed. Only six peers attended on this occasion. The king, well aware of the danger attending his primate and friend, sent him from Oxford a full pardon, signed and sealed with the great seal, which was secretly conveyed to Laud. It was a consolation to the archbishop to receive this testimony of the king's affection and care, though he foresaw that it would not be allowed to influence his fate, and it does not appear that any notice was taken of the document when Laud presented it to parliament.

The 10th of January, 1645, was fixed upon as the day of his execution. He received the intelligence with composure, for he was not afraid to die; but when informed that he was to be hung, he was moved, for he felt the indignity which would be offered in his person to the primate of the Church by such a mode of execution, and offered a petition that it might be changed to beheading. This reasonable request was granted by the lords, but was at first violently opposed in the commons. Laud's desire was, however, acceded to, but his request that his chaplains might attend him was only granted for one of them, doctor Sterne, and instead of the other two the commons appointed two presbyterians to offer him religious consolation. The archbishop was well prepared for death, and desired the attendance of his chaplains not only to assist him in the last solemn scene, but as witnesses of what he should do or say, since from the conduct of Prynne he had reason to fear that he might be misrepresented at the last.

When the public officers came to conduct him to execution, he seemed, says a contemporary, "like one who came not to die but to be translated." When on the scaffold he addressed the bystanders, and began with this text, "Let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God." Heb. xii. 1, 2. "I have been long in my race, and how I have looked unto Jesus the author and finisher of my faith, he best knows. I am now come to the end. I am going apace—I hope my cause in heaven will look of another dye than the colour that is put upon it here." He vindicated the character of the king, who had been accused by his enemies of a tendency to popery, saying that his majesty was "as guiltless of this charge as any man living—as sound a protestant according to the religion of the English Church as any man in his dominions, and that no one would more freely venture his life in defence of it." His conclusion was very affecting, "The last particular is myself. I was born and baptized in the bosom of the Church of England; in that profession I have ever since lived, and in that I come now to die. . . . I here declare in the presence of God and his holy angels, that I never endeavoured to subvert either law or religion. . . . But I have done. I forgive all the world, all and every of those bitter enemies who have persecuted me, and humbly desire to be forgiven of God first, and then of every man. And so I heartily desire you to join in prayer with me." His prayer, of which the following are extracts, is very beautiful:—"O eternal God and merciful Father, look down upon me in mercy. Look upon me, but not until thou hast nailed my sins to the cross of Christ; not till thou hast bathed me in the blood of Christ. . . . And since thou art pleased to try me to the uttermost, I humbly beseech thee give me now in this great moment full patience, and a heart ready to die for thine honour, the king's happiness, and this Church's preservation."

To the executioner he said, "Here, honest friend; God forgive thee as I do, and do thine office upon me in mercy." As he kneeled by the block, he continued in prayer, "Lord, I am coming as fast as I can; I know I must pass through the valley of the shadow of death before I can come to thee. Lord, receive my soul, and bless this kingdom with peace and plenty, and with brotherly love and charity, that there may not be the effusion of Christian blood amongst them, for Jesus Christ's sake." Having laid his head upon the block, he said, "Lord, receive my soul," which was his signal to the executioner; the axe fell, and at a single blow the venerable man was beheaded. "Thus fell Laud," says Heylin, "and the Church fell with him, the liturgy being voted down about the time of his condemnation." Such was the case, for the presbyterian directory had been drawn up, and was ordered to be used in March in all the churches, the Book of Common Prayer being strictly prohibited under severe penalties.

The body of the archbishop was interred in the church of All Hallow, Barking, near the tower, and though the suppression of the liturgy had been ordered, his enemies forgot to interpose; and to the comfort of those who followed him to the grave the funeral service of the Church was read, so that it seemed as if the liturgy for which he died was buried with him. It had been Laud's wish that his remains might rest within the walls of the college he loved so well, and this desire was accomplished, for after the restoration they were removed to the chapel of St. John's college at Oxford.¹

It has been remarked of archbishop Laud that more good and more evil has been said and written of him than of almost any other historical character. This may be accounted for by the fact that religious feeling and prejudice enters so largely into the events of his life, that it is difficult for either side to draw his character with strict justice. It seems that his manner was unpopular and his temper hasty; he does not appear to have been aware how much the world is influenced by looks, gestures, and tones of voice—that, in short, manner is something with everybody, and everything with some. The consequence was injurious to the cause which was nearest his heart. Whether the Church could have been saved by a ruler who knew how to secure both reverence and attachment, no one can say, but in those unquiet times she would be sure to suffer grievously for the unpopularity of her primate. One remark, however, may be justly made: nothing is more disgraceful to his adversaries than their wilful blindness to his virtues. His best friends were sensible of his faults; but his enemies were insensible to his many excellencies. By some writers his diary has been referred to as a proof of the weakness of his understanding, because of his occasional notices of dreams and omens; but many of the puritans and covenanters were firm believers in sorcery and witchcraft, and we may set down those weaknesses to the prevailing superstitions of the age. His expressions of trust in Providence, his forgiveness of his enemies and slanderers, the noble charitable designs which he accomplished, his care for the interests of learning, entitle him to honourable mention amongst the rulers of our Church. His qualities as a statesman may be questioned, and it would have been well had he never attempted those duties; but he failed to discern the spirit of the times and to see how much the union of sacred and secular offices was disliked, and how much envy was excited by the intrusion of the prelates into those high offices of state, for which the laity were no longer disqualified by defects of education and learning, as had been the case in earlier times.

With regard to the archbishop's government of the Church it must be remembered that in those days two objects were forced upon her rulers: the first was the treatment of such persons as came under the name of sectarians, the second the exaction

¹ Collier, vol. viii., p. 274. Dean Hook, vol. vi., p. 351. Le Bas's *Life of Laud*, ch. viii.

of uniformity in the celebration of divine worship within the Church. We now live in an age of toleration, which allows every person to choose his own place of worship, or to attend none. Many people, therefore, cannot understand that there ever was a time when it was thought right to disturb or punish individuals for worshipping God according to their conscience or fancy. It is, therefore, necessary to remind them that there *have* been such times, and that the law as it then stood required ecclesiastical governors to enforce such discipline. It has been said that Laud was not only in favour of an arbitrary king, but of an intolerant Church. If the archbishop was for an intolerant Church, that many-headed bishop, the presbytery, was for a Church infinitely more so. He was called a popish innovator, whereas the only fault of which he can be justly accused was that of a hasty and impetuous reformer. He revived too suddenly those practices which his Calvinistic predecessor, Abbot, had allowed to fall into disuse. The offer of a cardinal's hat to Laud, after he was made archbishop, became a cause of reproach to him. This proposal was in accordance with Romish policy, for, whether accepted or not, the very offer was sure to throw suspicion on the primate. Laud has been accused by his puritan adversaries of vexing the "painful and godly ministers of the gospel." The truth is, he used the power of the law to suppress violent and inflammatory preaching, which was then so greatly employed for the purpose of rousing and encouraging through the kingdom a spirit of disaffection towards the Church and the crown. It is necessary to dwell on these topics, because it is so often asserted that the religious disputes which began in the time of Elizabeth about trifling matters, were developed by persecution into a regular political antagonism in the time of her two successors. This statement is unjust, and is intended to enlist all sympathy on the side of the nonconformists and sectarians, whereas it would be more correct to say that the controversies had resulted in a struggle for existence on the part of the Anglican Church, and for supremacy on the part of her opponents. The presbyterian system of that day was as intolerant as the papacy.¹

The political principles of the independents were republican, and they were called at that time root-and-branch men. Many of the exiles had returned from New England, and were of this sect. Moreover, Cromwell himself was of the same persuasion. The battle of Marston Moor in July, 1644, which ended so unfavourably for the royalists, had been won by Cromwell and his ironsides, as the dragoons were called. The army was now re-organized and was called the "new model," at the head of which Fairfax was placed, and Oliver Cromwell appointed lieutenant-general. It is true that members of both houses of parliament had been declared incapable of military command, but this "self-denying ordinance," as it was called, was suspended in favour of Cromwell. The

¹ See Le Bas's *Life of Archbishop Laud*, ch. ix., to which the reader is referred for further arguments on these subjects.

gallant Montrose was rousing the Highlanders in favour of the king, and the Scotch were therefore beginning to think it would be necessary for them to return to their own country.

But in June, 1645, the battle of Naseby was fought, and the king's army was entirely routed; Charles retreated towards Abergavenny, and remained for a time in Wales or on its borders. The principality had distinguished itself by its loyalty, and Raglan castle, on the borders of Wales, has the honour of being the last royal fortress which was unsubdued; it was held for the king by the veteran earl of Worcester, aged 82. It was in the autumn of 1644 that the marquis of Montrose began the enterprise which has made his name so illustrious; after repeatedly defeating his opponents, he approached the English border in the spirit of his noble verses:

“ He either fears his fate too much,
Or his deserts are small,
Who dares not put it to the touch
To win or lose it all.”

Montrose hoped to assist his royal master, but was surprised and totally defeated at Philiphaugh, by a force sent from the Scottish army in England. The covenanters inflicted a cruel vengeance on the royalists after this victory. The Irish prisoners were executed without any trial whatever, and four Scotch officers of rank were beheaded in the principal street of St. Andrew's, amongst whom was Sir Robert Spottiswood, a son of the late excellent archbishop of that city,¹ but Montrose escaped his enemies on this occasion.

After the victory at Naseby the parliament repeated their order for the use of the directory with penalties upon all who refused to comply, or who made use of the Book of Common Prayer. If any one preached or printed anything against the directory, he was to be fined; and those who read the Common Prayer, whether in a church or in their families, were likewise to be fined, and on the third offence to be imprisoned. The Westminster confession of faith took the place of the thirty-nine articles. It is worthy of note that the date on which this ordinance came into force was St. Bartholomew's day. On that day, in 1645, churchmen were forbidden to worship God according to their own conscience, even in their families.

Doctor Hackett (afterwards bishop of Lichfield) is recorded as the last man in England who persisted to read the liturgy after its use had been forbidden by the parliament. The following proof of his courage is given by his biographer:—One Sunday, while reading the service in his church, a soldier of the parliament forces clapped a pistol to his breast and commanded him to read no further. The clergyman calmly replied, “I will do what becomes a divine, and you may do what becomes a soldier;” the tumult caused by the occurrence was quieted for that time, and the doctor was permitted to proceed.²

¹ Grub, vol. iii., pp. 113, 114.

² *Life of Bishop Hackett*, by J. Plume, D.D., ed. by Rev. Mackenzie Walcot, p. 64.

The Scots disagreed with the English parliament, and did not approve of its having so much control over church affairs; but notwithstanding the discontent of its northern allies, parliament was very unwilling that its spiritual empire should suffer any restraint. In proportion, however, as the aid of the Scottish soldiers became less necessary, the influence of their religious tenets decreased. In October, 1645, episcopacy (root and branch) was suppressed by a parliamentary ordinance, the lands of the cathedrals were sold, church festivals abolished, and, under the plea of removing superstitious articles, churches were plundered and profaned. Christmas day in this year was kept by command of parliament as a solemn fast. "If," says the historian Collier, "the parliament had been Jews, they could hardly have put a greater affront upon Christianity."

The presbyterians and independents were beginning to diverge considerably from each other, though they were agreed upon the extirpation of prelacy. As their differences increased, the independents again demanded toleration, and freedom to form congregations upon their own model. A committee was formed with the view of an accommodation, but the presbyterians were not disposed to agree to the demands of their brother nonconformists: they required that their directory and confession of faith should be adopted by the independents, and gave as a reason for demanding uniformity, that "there was not the least example in all the Holy Scriptures" for the request made by the independents, and that any other course would "encourage schism and division." The independents replied "that the abuse of the word 'schism' had done the Church a great deal of harm"—upon which the presbyterians affirmed very decidedly, "that scruple of conscience is no good plea against the charge of schism." It would be too long and tedious to enter fully into the arguments between the two sects, but the reader cannot fail to observe that the presbyterians regarded any separation from themselves in a very different light to their own separation from the Church.¹

In the army the feeling against presbyterianism was generally very bitter, but the presbyterian element in the house of commons was still strong enough to settle the terms offered to the sovereign. If he would take the covenant and support the new order of things in religious matters, they would suffer him to retain the name of king. At length, losing all hope of prevailing with the parliament either by force of arms or by treaty, the king resolved to throw himself upon the duty and honour of his northern subjects, and in May, 1646, entered the camp of the Scotch army, which lay before Newark, in Nottinghamshire, but Charles's hope of support against the parliament or the English army was vain, and the Scots, perceiving that the king would not sign the covenant, and being anxious that the expenses of their campaign in England should be paid, informed the parliament that they were ready to

¹ Collier, vol. viii., p. 297.

surrender their sovereign to them on condition that the sum of £400,000 due for their services in England was paid. The money was handed over, and in January, 1647, the Scotch marched back to their country, leaving the king in the hands of the parliamentary commissioners. When the Scottish presbyterians gave up the sovereign, who had thrown himself upon their generosity, they did not anticipate the dark crime which was to terminate his life, and this surrender of Charles by his Scottish subjects has found apologists, some of whom have tried to justify it as not contrary to any duty, others to excuse it as the only course consistent with the safety of the northern kingdom. The justification and the excuse are alike unavailing; they sold their prince for a sum of money into the hands of his bitterest enemies, and the transaction admits of no defence and of no palliation.¹

Charles was lodged at Holmby house, in Northamptonshire, detained as a prisoner, though treated with outward marks of respect. The army and the parliament now began to quarrel. General Fairfax, who possessed much military talent, seems to have been too honest a man to enter into the cabals of the rebellion. Cromwell, on the other hand, was no friend to half measures, and had seen from the first that troops composed of the nobility and gentry must surpass in courage and spirit those composed of mechanics and servants; but he knew and taught the world the lesson that religious fanaticism was as powerful a motive as the sense of honour,² and fanaticism in his hands became a mighty power; for, if not a fanatic himself, he knew how to teach and lead those who were such. The assistance of the Scotch, prince Rupert's rashness, and the king's want of decision, had thrown the scale in favour of Cromwell's troopers, of which, with his resolute will and consummate skill as a commander, he readily availed himself. The state of England during this, the last of her civil wars, was wretched.

It was now thought by the presbyterian majority in the house of commons that the time had arrived when the army should be disbanded, but parliament soon found that it had raised a power which it could not control. The soldiers had not fought for the supremacy of parliament only, but considered themselves to be, and intended to become, the chief power in the state. Cromwell was resolved to get the king into his hands, and in June, 1647, cornet Joyce with a party of horse rode to Holmby house, and informed the king that he was desired to remove him. Charles asked for his commission. "It is there," answered Joyce, pointing to his soldiers. This argument was irresistible, and the king was first conveyed to Newcastle, where the army lay, and afterwards to Hampton Court, from whence he managed to escape to the southern coast, but was seized and lodged in Carisbrooke castle, where he was closely watched.

¹ Grub, vol. iii., p. 123.

² Bishop Short, p. 415.

Parliament had not only abolished the name and office of archbishops and bishops, but had agreed to dispose of the lands belonging to the episcopal sees, which were sold in order to raise money to pay the sum demanded by the Scotch army for delivering up the king. We mentioned that a committee had been appointed by the house of commons in December, 1640, to consider some way of "removing scandalous ministers, and putting others in their places." This committee, which consisted of sixty-one persons, was afterwards divided into several smaller ones, in order that the business might be more effectually dispatched. Information respecting such ministers was diligently sought for; and if only a few inhabitants combined against the clergyman, they were considered as the parish, though the greater part of the parish petitioned for his continuance amongst them. Indeed, few ventured to offer opposition not only because success was not to be hoped for, but because those who opposed these proceedings ran the risk of being treated as malignants. When the ordinance for taking the covenant was passed in February, 1644, and when the use of the directory was enforced in January, 1645, these two instruments of oppression made the task of ejecting scandalous ministers, and sequestrating their livings easy. The witnesses against the clergy, whose only crime was their loyalty to Church and king, were either parishioners who had been offended, or informers who were encouraged by the commissioners, and none of them were examined upon oath.

The parliament having had recourse to arms against their sovereign, could not of course allow the loyal clergy to remain as spiritual teachers; but as it was not convenient to give this reason for turning them out of their benefices, accusations against the characters of the ministers were invented. The parliament which professed to advocate the cause of the subject was thus guilty of gross acts of oppression. In July, 1646, when there appeared to be some prospect of disagreement between the commons and the army, the ejected clergy presented petitions to the parliamentary general, Sir Thomas Fairfax, and to the king; but, as might be expected, they were ineffectual. The provision settled for the families of these clergy was after much delay fixed at one fifth of their preferments, but this was subject to so many restrictions and got with so much difficulty that few could obtain it, nor was it ever allowed to those who had been members of cathedral churches.¹ This allowance of a fifth part was granted only at the option of the commissioners, and as in many cases the clergyman had been obliged to fly in order to preserve his life or liberty, the poor wife and children had little chance of obtaining this pittance from their oppressors, especially as no money had been left to them to pay for legal assistance. Their distress and poverty were, therefore, very great.

When the city of Oxford fell into the hands of the rebels, visitors were empowered by parliament to enquire into the malignancy

¹ Walker's *Sufferings of the Clergy*, 1 vol., quarto ed., 1714., part i., p. 64.
Bishop Short, p. 443.

of the university—this word meaning its loyalty. Before the visitors arrived, it was determined by convocation¹ that members of the university should draw up their opinions upon the covenant, directory, &c. Their objections are too lengthy for the limits of this work, but their remarks upon the tendency of the covenant to promote discord amongst Christians and ill will towards crowned heads were just and forcible. They said that they did not feel at liberty to adopt the directory and suppress the Book of Common Prayer without the royal assent. This resolution after being considered in the colleges passed in convocation, and when we remember that the city was full of parliamentary troops, this protest must be regarded as a bold and honest step, and a noble defence of the Church and constitution. The university chose rather to lose fortune and risk life than suffer in its conscience and tarnish its honour. Neither the assembly of divines at Westminster nor any other members of that party replied to this protest; but argument was unnecessary when force was at hand. In July, 1648, the heads of the colleges were expelled, including doctor Fell, who was the dean of Christ church and vice-chancellor of the university. Those members of the colleges who declined to move were warned by a military force and beat of drum that they would be imprisoned; and as they still hesitated, the musketeers presented the further order that if they presumed to remain or were found within five miles of the city, they would be treated as spies and put to death.²

The university of Cambridge also suffered greatly. The masters and fellows of the colleges had sent their plate to the king in 1641, and to deter them from giving further assistance, some of the heads of houses were committed to the Tower. The university was afterwards purged of the malignant members, as the loyally disposed were called. Soldiers were quartered in the colleges, and the chapels were plundered and defaced.

The Scots made great complaints of the prevalence of sects in England, and declared that the kingdom was now backsliding from the solemn league and covenant. These complaints were caused by the change in the state of parties. When the presbyterians had conquered, and got the king into Holmby house, when they had battered down the Church, ousted the greater part of the regular clergy and got their discipline settled by parliament, they met with unexpected misfortunes. The "new model," as the army was called, was composed chiefly of independents. Cromwell, Ireton, and Fleetwood, its chiefs, were of that sect, and fomented the divisions and disorders which now arose. General Fairfax, who was the nominal commander-in-chief, knew nothing of the intention to seize the person of the king, this stroke of policy having been arranged by Cromwell to whom the supreme command of the army was now given by acclamation; and whilst the house of commons was meditating the committal of Cromwell to the Tower, he marched

¹ The convocation of the university is meant.

² Collier, vol. viii., p. 326—340. Walker's *Sufferings*, ch. i., p. 138.

towards London, took military possession of the city, and expelled some of the leaders of the presbyterian party from the house.

In April, 1648, a Scotch army under the duke of Hamilton was about to cross the border, with the object of restoring Charles to the throne and preserving the presbyterian discipline. Royalist risings now took place, first in Wales, then in Cornwall and Devon. Kent also rose against the independents. Cromwell hurried into South Wales, where he left his mark on many a church and ancient castle; and, after suppressing the royalist endeavours there, he marched northwards, and attacking the army of Hamilton at Preston, subdued and scattered it after a hard-fought battle. In the mean time Fairfax, having suppressed the rising in Kent, besieged the main body of the southern royalists in Colchester, which was taken after a terrible struggle, and thus the efforts of the royalists finally ended.

Whilst the army was thus employed, the expelled presbyterian members returned to the house of commons and entered into negotiations with the king, but this the victorious army was determined to stop, and on their once more obtaining possession of the royal person, the king was conveyed from the isle of Wight to Hurst castle, a desolate spot near the sea. Charles imagined that his murder was intended, but the leaders of the army did not meditate it at that place or in that manner, and intended to invest it with a judicial form. It was resolved to overpower the commons, and Cromwell's master spirit was again at work. Regiments were quartered in the neighbourhood of the house, two of which under the command of Col. Pride proceeded to Westminster hall, where, after seizing some members, and excluding others, they reduced the number who were permitted to remain to about fifty or sixty. This discipline was called 'Pride's purge,' and the remnant left obtained the name of the 'Rump' parliament. These members were sufficiently obsequious and proceeded to vote hearty thanks to general Cromwell for his great services, and at the same time declared that the commons formed the supreme power in England, and had no need of king or house of lords.

The nation was now terrified; many began to carry their effects out of the country, and even the internal commerce commenced to stagnate. The trial of the king was now resolved upon, and he was brought to Windsor under a strong guard. On the 1st of January, 1649, a self-created tribunal, styled a high court of justice, met in Westminster hall, the members of which were chiefly taken from the army and the remains of the parliament still sitting, the president being a lawyer, named Bradshaw. The king, being brought from St. James's palace and placed at the bar, was charged with tyranny, especially in making war upon his subjects. Never did Charles appear to more advantage than on this occasion. His step was firm, his countenance unmoved, and with all that kingly dignity which he possessed, he refused to answer to a tribunal created in defiance of the laws. On his return from the hall, men and women crowded behind the guards, and called aloud, "God preserve your

majesty," but one of the soldiers venturing to say, "God bless you, sir," received a stroke on the head from an officer. During the time of the trial a strong military force was kept under arms to suppress any demonstration of popular feeling in favour of the king. On the first day, when the name of general Fairfax was called, a female voice cried from the gallery, "He has more wit than to be here." On another occasion, when Bradshaw said the charge against the king was brought with the consent of the people of England, the same voice exclaimed, "No, not one-tenth of the people." The speaker was the lady Fairfax, the wife of the commander-in-chief, and the affront was (probably on that account) suffered to pass unnoticed. But judgment had already been decided on, though this mockery of a trial was extended to seven days. Sentence of death was then pronounced by Bradshaw. Cromwell's speech on the occasion may be regarded as worthy of the actors in this scene. "Should any one have proposed to bring the king to punishment, I should have regarded him as the greatest traitor; but since Providence has cast us upon it, I will pray to God for a blessing upon your councils, though I am not prepared to give you advice on this important occasion."

The king's conduct during these proceedings had raised his character even in the estimation of his enemies. On Sunday, January 28th, he passed his time in devotion, attended by his chaplain, Herbert, and by Juxon, bishop of London. Several noblemen came to pay him their last respects, but though he thanked them for their attachment and desired their prayers, he said that the shortness of his time warned him to think of another world, and the only moments he could spare must be given to his children. The prince of Wales and the duke of York had escaped to Holland, but the princess Elizabeth and the duke of Gloucester were still in England. The latter was only seven years old. They wept while he placed them on his knees, gave such advice as was suited to their years, and dismissed them with his blessing.¹ On the morning of January 30th, Charles was conducted from St. James's palace to Whitehall, where he remained for two hours in constant expectation of the last summons, spending this time in prayer, and in discourse with bishop Juxon and his chaplain, Herbert. This delay has been attributed to the receipt by the commissioners of letters from the prince of Wales from the Hague, addressed to the king and Fairfax, which, together with that general's endeavours to postpone the execution, may have induced the leaders to pause. But they had committed themselves too deeply. The prince's letter was, however, delivered to his father, who had the consolation of learning that his son's thoughts were with him.²

¹ The princess, who was then fourteen, grieved much for her father's melancholy end, and died at Carisbrooke, isle of Wight, during the following year. Queen Victoria caused a monument to her memory to be placed in the church a few years since.

² From Lingard, quoted in Collier, vol. viii., p. 361.

The following affecting narrative of the execution we quote from dean Hook:—"While the king was awaiting for the last summons at Whitehall and was engaged in private prayer, Herbert told bishop Juxon that he was unable to endure the sight of his master on the block. The bishop with his usual presence of mind and desire to assist others, told Herbert to wait in the banqueting house, near the scaffold, to take care of the king's body. 'For,' said he, 'that and his interment will be our last office.' The last signal was now given at the chamber door by colonel Hacker. The bishop and Herbert fell upon their knees weeping, and the king gave them his hand to kiss, and helped the bishop to rise, for Juxon was no longer a young man. Along the galleries of the banqueting house there was a guard; but behind the soldiers, men and women crowded to behold the fate of royalty. The king's countenance brightened when, as he passed by, he heard them pray for him, and Herbert remarks 'that even the soldiers, instead of rebuking the crowd or insulting the king, seemed afflicted by what they were commanded to do.' At the extremity of the hall an opening was made in the wall leading straight to the scaffold, which was hung with black. Two men, dressed as sailors, and masked, stood by the axe. The king stepped forward with his usual dignity of manner. The whole space was occupied by the troops, and no one could approach. He spoke a few words, and in conclusion said, 'I declare before you all that I die a Christian, according to the profession of the Church of England.' He told the executioner that he would say a very short prayer, 'And when I thrust out my hands —' Once more he turned towards the bishop and said, 'I have a good cause and a gracious God on my side.' The bishop replied, 'There is but one stage more; the stage is turbulent and troublesome. It is a short one, but you may consider it will soon carry you a very great way. It will carry you from earth to heaven.' 'I go,' added the king, 'from a corruptible to an incorruptible crown, where no disturbance can be.' 'You are exchanged,' said the bishop in conclusion, 'from a temporal to an eternal crown; a good exchange.'

"The king took off his cloak, and with it his 'George,' which he delivered to the bishop, saying, 'Remember.' Having asked the executioner whether his hair was sufficiently tucked up, he put on his cloak again. 'When I put out my hands this way,' stretching them out, 'then' —. He stood with his hands and eyes lifted up, and said a few words to himself. He stooped down; he laid his neck upon the block. A short pause ensued; the king stretched forth his hands. At one blow his head was severed from his body. The executioner held up the head, and showed it to the people, saying, 'Behold the head of a traitor!'

"A suppressed but almost universal groan was uttered by the people, who were removed at a little distance from the troops. The groan was heard by Cromwell, and a troop of horse was marched rapidly through to disperse and scatter the multitude.

"The king's word, 'Remember,' excited much attention. A plot

was suspected, and the bishop's papers were examined. But Juxon asserted that the king's word referred to the conveyance of the 'George' to the prince of Wales, with a message from his dying father to the effect that if the prince were ever restored to the crown, he might forgive the authors of his death."¹

The ruling authorities consented to the decent burial of the king, but Cromwell, who well knew the state of public opinion, would not permit it to be in Westminster abbey; for the feelings already exhibited made it doubtful what would occur on such an occasion, when a large concourse of people would be brought together. He knew that any disrespect to the remains would be equally impolitic. Windsor had been one of the burying-places of the English kings, and it was determined that a grave should be prepared there in St. George's chapel. The body, under the charge of bishop Juxon and Herbert, followed by those who obtained the privilege of paying the last honours to their much-loved master, was conveyed to Windsor, and on the 7th of February the royal remains were borne to the chapel. It was fine when the little procession started, but the snow soon fell so thickly that the velvet pall was perfectly white; an emblem, said the sorrowing royalists, of the innocence of the martyr.

The bishop of London was about to read the funeral service, when he was sternly silenced by colonel Whichcote, governor of the castle, who, with some of his officers, had entered the chapel. He said the Book of Common Prayer had been put down, "and never," he exclaimed, "shall it be used in any garrison in which I command." The tears and secret prayers of the faithful followers of a monarch they had loved so well were not, however, to be restrained. The coffin was lowered, the mourners looked in upon the grave, and there on a silver plate attached to the leaden coffin they read the simple inscription, "King Charles."

The puritans circulated reports that the coffin was an empty one, and that the king was interred elsewhere; but in the year 1813 the vault was opened in the presence of the prince-regent, afterwards George IV., and the existence of the royal remains was proved.

The bishop of London was dispossessed of his papers and of the "George," which the late king had committed to his care, and was questioned as to the last royal word, "Remember." He was then left in peace and retired into Gloucestershire. He appeared to have possessed private means, with which he assisted the poor clergy; but during the first years of his retirement he stood in awe of the soldiers of the Commonwealth, and like many of the royalists at that time, found it prudent to have a secret means of escape in his house, wherein he could find a hiding-place.²

The portraits of Charles I., by the celebrated Vandyck, are well known—a handsome face with a sweet but mournful expression, dark eyes, lofty brow and long curling hair, with moustache and

¹ Dean Hook's *Lives of the Archbishops*, vol. vi., p. 410—414.

² Dean Hook's *Lives of the Archbishops* (Juxon), vol. vi., p. 414—418.

pointed beard. His character is thus drawn by one who knew him well:—"He was the worthiest gentleman, the best master, the best friend, the best husband, the best father, and the best Christian that the age in which he lived produced. And if he were not the best king, if he were without some parts and qualities which have made some kings great and happy, no other prince was ever unhappy who was possessed of half his virtues and endowments, and so much without any kind of vice."¹ Another writer says he was more fitted to rule in a regular established government than either to give way to, or to subdue the encroachments of a popular assembly. Some have questioned his good faith; but when we consider the extreme difficulty of his position, and the minute scrutiny his conduct has undergone, extending even to his most private correspondence; the fidelity which he displayed to his religious convictions and his honesty of purpose (though accompanied with too lofty ideas of royal prerogative) are sufficiently established. "The trial of the king," says Hallam, "was the act of a bold but small minority who . . . had usurped power under the protection of a military force. I cannot perceive what there was in . . . that insolent mockery of the forms of justice, accompanied by unfairness and inhumanity, which can alleviate the guilt of the transaction." It is very certain that no character in public or in private life has been more malignantly or more vigorously sifted than that of Charles I., and it may be fairly asked where is any other to be found who could have stood such an ordeal so well?

¹ Clarendon, b. xi., p. 698.

CHAPTER XXIX.

CENTURY XVII.

FROM THE DEATH OF CHARLES I. TO THE DEATH OF OLIVER CROMWELL,
SEPTEMBER, 1658.

THE execution of the king was not desired by the presbyterians, and the ministers of that party in London were filled with horror at the act. When the trial—or rather the semblance of one—was determined on, they addressed a remonstrance to the chief actors which contained a bold reprimand to a victorious army, and afterwards published a paper in which they disclaimed with detestation the proceedings of the regicides. The presbyterian ministers, however, had led matters on to this extremity by the zeal with which they had encouraged the war against Charles. Immediately after the death of the king the house of lords, which had been reduced to a mere shadow of its former power, was abolished, and the whole management of affairs passed into the hands of the independents.¹

The form of government was changed into that of a republic, or commonwealth, as it was called, and so remained for a period of eleven years. It was vested in a council of forty-one members, of which Bradshaw, the regicide, was president. Cromwell and Fairfax directed the army, Sir Harry Vane the navy; but Cromwell and his soldiers really ruled the country. An oath was now exacted called the *Engagement*, which may not improperly be called the ‘covenant’ of the independents, the form of the oath to be taken by each person being, “That he would be true and faithful to the government established without king or house of peers, and that he would never consent to the re-admitting of either of them again;” and whoever refused to take this oath or engagement was thereby rendered incapable of holding any place or office in Church or state. This not only excluded the royalists, but also those of the presbyterian party who, as lord Clarendon says, “durst not sacrifice their beloved covenant to this new engagement.”²

An act was now passed for what was termed the “propagation of the gospel in Wales,” though it might more correctly have been described as its hindrance. The clergy in the principality had not yet to any great extent been removed and sequestered; though in June, 1641, when the committees for sequestrating church property had been erected in various counties, some clergy were ejected in South Wales. The remoteness of the country probably saved the Church there for the time. The loyalty which Wales had exhibited caused the party now in power to turn their eyes thither more particularly,

¹ Collier, vol. viii., pp. 356, 373.

² Clarendon, b. xi., p. 700.

and to compensate for the delay by inflicting a double portion of oppression. It was resolved to act against the loyal Welsh clergy as malignants, and to bring the revenues of the Church into the government treasury. The author from whom we are about to quote obtained his information from a collection of papers at Lambeth which related to ecclesiastical matters during those troubled times, also from the accounts of the sequestrations in South Wales under the propagation; "taken at Neath in August, 1655, by order of the lord protector." The latter papers were supplied to him by Mr. Baron Price, and Mr. Walker states that his book was written not only to show the hardships and sufferings endured by the loyal clergy during the great rebellion, but also to meet and answer the statements put forth in doctor Calamy's abridgment of the *Life of Baxter*, wherein he relates the numbers and characters of those nonconformist ministers who were "silenced and ejected by the act of uniformity."¹

Hugh Peters, a Welshman and a friend of Cromwell, being asked to give his opinion as to the best mode of propagating the gospel in Wales, replied that "they must sequester all the clergy without exception, and bring the revenues of the Church into one public treasury, out of which must be allowed £100 a year to six itinerant preachers to preach in every county." This plan was afterwards adopted, the care of carrying it out being committed to Vavasor Powell, Walter Cradock, and some others. These persons represented their countrymen "as pagans and infidels, knowing nothing of God or godliness, and so having great need to be converted," and at the same time used every method to throw calumny and reproach upon the clergy, and upon their ministerial office. Powell had formerly been indicted for having forged his orders as a clergyman, and for using seditious language. Being thus checked in the use of the pulpit, he held forth in private houses; and, coming to London in 1642, took advantage of the disturbed times to give full vent to the violence of his feelings against the monarchy and the Church. He returned into Wales after that country had been brought under the power of the parliament, and having been named as one of the commissioners to carry out the scheme suggested by Hugh Peters, he became one of the chief itinerant preachers, receiving payment as the others did from the sequestered property of the clergy. He seems to have been neither a presbyterian nor an independent, but to have belonged to those who were called 'fifth-monarchy' men—a set of enthusiastic fanatics whose wild expressions bordered on blasphemy, while they believed that the personal reign of the saints on earth had come, and that the saints were themselves. As a commissioner and an itinerant, Powell was more active than any other person, and when the petition (of which we shall presently speak) was presented to the parliament against the "propagators," he left no means untried to suppress it. He

¹ See the preface to Walker's *Sufferings of the Clergy*. Also part i., p. 151.

was guilty of extreme tyranny and oppression towards the ejected ministers in Wales.¹

The chief design of the measure, as laid down by Hugh Peters, was to abolish the institution of all parochial ministers, and to substitute occasional and stipendiary preachers; and it was purposed to extend this plan to all parts of the kingdom, especially to the four northern counties of England. In order to give a plausible colouring to the ejection of the Welsh parochial clergy, charges of inefficiency, drunkenness, and other scandals were brought against them besides that of malignancy. A refusal to take the "engagement" was also visited with the utmost rigour.

Far be it from us to say that none of the sequestered clergy in Wales were guilty of conduct unworthy of their sacred calling; but there is abundant proof that "delinquency" (or in another word loyalty) was the real cause of the removal of the parochial ministers. The author from whom we are quoting obtained information from papers presented in obedience to parliament in 1652, giving an account "from the commission for propagation of the gospel in Wales, of the sequestered tithes, church livings, &c., within the counties of South Wales and Monmouth." These papers seem to have been presented in consequence of the petition of the inhabitants of those counties against the acts of the commissioners. Vavasor Powell said that he knew of no clergy in the six counties of North Wales that had "the power of godliness, and very few that had the form of it." Hugh Peters declared that "all the Welsh clergy were drunken and debauched and ignorant, and not fit to be trusted with a kennel of hounds." But against these sweeping charges there is the authority of the high sheriff of Brecknockshire in the return made by him, wherein it is shown that clergy were sequestered under the plea of "not only assisting the king, but for swearing and drunkenness," who were not merely learned, but pious and godly persons, several of whom are mentioned by name. We may, therefore, suppose this to be a fair sample of other counties in Wales, and it will thus be found that hundreds of those ejected were neither scandalous livers nor unpreaching curates, but, as expressed in this petition from South Wales, "their calling was their crime, and their mission was their ruin." In fact, no respect was paid to their fidelity and ability in teaching, or their sobriety of conduct; those only were spared who were ignorant, and willing to come to terms with the commissioners. To give one or two instances; the commissioners condemned the clergyman of Talgarth and Llyswen as a swearer and scandalous, as well as a malignant minister. The high sheriff of Brecon says he was a master of arts, and an able, pious, and learned man. Mr. Thomas, master of arts, rector of Ystradgynlais,

¹ Vavasor Powell has been represented by some Welsh writers as a man of extreme zeal and piety. Those who approve of the method by which the gospel was "propagated" in Wales at this time may be expected to approve also of the conduct of its chief promoters; but a perusal of both sides of the question should lead these persons to a very different conclusion—namely, that the gospel was almost extinguished in Wales during the so-called propagation.

Brecknockshire, was a learned man of exemplary life, and a preacher in Welsh and English ; he was sequestered, and the same charges were brought against him as in the case of the clergyman of Talgarth. Mr. Thomas's church lay vacant, his place being supplied about once a month by a person who was a thatcher by trade ; and afterwards the commissioners employed a ploughman of twenty-two years of age, who did not even reside in the place. Another university clergyman, described as an able and pious man, was succeeded by a mason. We know that in those days education had not extended to the lower classes of the community ; it was therefore mockery to place them as instructors in lieu of clergy of whom one of the pretended causes of removal was insufficiency of learning. What with committees, propagators, and commissioners, the unfortunate clergy in North and South Wales were wholly deprived of their maintenance, and their wives and families were reduced to the greatest want. Their parishioners had to put up with itinerants, who were for the most part completely uneducated ; and, the progress of the gospel having received such a check, the want of religion in the principality, as described by the revivalists of the eighteenth century, is not a matter of surprise.

In 1652 the inhabitants of South Wales could stand this state of things no longer, and the petition referred to above was presented to the house of commons. It represented that few or none of the counties had been supplied with competent, godly, and able teachers, and that parts of the country, wherein there were from fifty to sixty parishes, had not above four or five itinerant preachers ; that the churches in most places were closed, and in the county of Montgomery forty-seven were left vacant on the Lord's day, which was well nigh every parish in the county ; that thus the people had neither the comfort of preaching nor praying, neither of the sacraments, nor visiting of the sick, nor any decency of burial ; that they endured a famine of the word of God ; that many hundreds had turned to popery, and that such was especially the case in Brecknockshire. Colonel Freeman, who presented the petition, told the house that the light of the gospel was almost extinguished, and that little of the money taken from the Church had been used towards its propagation. He begged parliament to call such persons as had received the profits of the tithes and church dues to account, and stated that the teachers wanted to be themselves instructed in the first principles of the oracles of God, and that they were such as brought preaching into contempt and derision.

The petition was signed by about fifteen thousand inhabitants, many of whom were not members of the poor ruined royalist party, but persons well affected to the present government. Col. Freeman was himself attorney-general for South Wales, and was attended by several other gentlemen. There arose between the petitioners and the propagators great disputes, which were still going on in 1656 and probably continued till the restoration.¹ Such is only a slight

¹ Walker's *Sufferings of the Clergy*, p. 146—170.

sketch of the so-called propagation of the gospel in Wales during the downfall of the Church and crown. Our readers will form their own opinions upon the result of such a state of affairs.

In Ireland the gallant earl (now marquis) of Ormonde, who was lord lieutenant, had vainly endeavoured to maintain the fortunes of royalty; and, being compelled to surrender Dublin to the parliament, he left the kingdom for a time. After the king's death prince Rupert and the broken remains of the cavalier army went to Ireland, and Ormonde having returned, it seemed as if Charles's death would be avenged in that country by a coalition of royalists, Romanists, and presbyterians.

In August, 1649, Cromwell, who was appointed lord lieutenant by the parliament, landed at Dublin with thirteen thousand men; a small but resolute body of troops, who fought with the understanding that their wages were to be Irish lands, and that they were to take the place of those proprietors whose holdings had been forfeited by their loyalty. A vast military protestant settlement was intended to terminate the Irish difficulty. In September Cromwell laid siege to Drogheda, which was manned by English royalists and commanded by a brave governor, Sir Arthur Ashton. Twice were the storming party repulsed; the third time Cromwell led them in person, became master of the town, and ordered every man found in arms to be put to death. The order was obeyed, but a few held out till the morning; every tenth man was then shot, and the remainder sent to the penal settlements in the West Indies.¹ In the storming of Drogheda it is asserted that there was an indiscriminate massacre of men, women, and children. This has been denied, but when victorious troops are desired to give no quarter, and when religious and political hatred are united, there can be little doubt of the severities inflicted. Wexford shared a similar fate; the war was carried on against royalists, papists, and the native Irish alike, and Ormonde's troops were slain or scattered. Cromwell seems to have thought some excuse was needed for the savage effectiveness with which his conquest was prosecuted. "I am persuaded," he wrote, "that this is a righteous judgment of God upon those barbarous wretches who have imbrued their hands in so much innocent blood." He alluded to the massacre in 1641 by the native Irish, but the sufferers at Drogheda were chiefly English whose crime was loyalty. In the spring of 1650 Cromwell quitted Ireland; and when his successors had brought the war to an end in 1652, three out of four of the Irish provinces were confiscated to the conquering race, and the native landowners were driven to find what sustenance they could in the wild far-west province of Connaught.² The terror of Cromwell's name was so great that "The curse of Cromwell upon you" was used in the south of Ireland as an expression of deadly hatred.

An act was passed for what was called the advancement of the

¹ Froude's *English in Ireland*, vol. i., p. 120.

² Gardiner, ch. viii., sec. 1.

gospel in Ireland, and another for abolishing the episcopate there and forbidding the use of the Book of Common Prayer.¹

Cromwell on his return to London received public thanks, and was created lord general of the armies of the commonwealth. His presence was required; for the Scotch, who disapproved of the execution of the king, were prepared to welcome the young prince of Wales, afterwards Charles II.

From the commencement of the rebellion in Scotland in 1638 to the period when Cromwell seized the reins of government, the Scottish kirk appears as a political faction. When those who opposed the covenant fell into the hands of the more active members of the kirk, they were treated with much cruelty. The latter attempted to justify their conduct by quoting the dealings of Joshua with the nations of Canaan. At a later period, when the fate of the king was no longer doubtful, the Scottish parliament resolved to interfere in his behalf. This resolution gave offence to the ministers of the kirk. It was in vain that the parliament reminded them that their interference in civil matters was not consistent with the ecclesiastical law. The general assembly did not heed the reproof, but called on all the ministers, "as they would escape the censures of the Church," to oppose the resolution of parliament, both in their conferences and public discourses. Some of the more temperate ministers, disgusted with such violent proceedings, refused compliance with this order, but they soon felt the anger of the leading covenanters. Several were deposed, and others suspended, from their office. The interests of religion were made of secondary importance to the political position, and men who had complained at the commencement of Charles's reign, because the ecclesiastics of the episcopal Church held office and exercised civil authority, did not hesitate to set the parliament at defiance, and in effect to assume the functions of government. After the execution of Charles I. the presbyterian ministers, who detested the religious opinions of Cromwell and the independents, listened to proposals for raising to the throne the prince of Wales,² who at first declined those overtures, as he disliked the idea of becoming a presbyterian. The gallant marquis of Montrose, who had fought so bravely for the late king, resolved to attempt a royalist rising in Scotland, which should be independent of the covenanters. Loyalty with Montrose was a passion as well as a duty. He had vowed when he heard of the execution of Charles I. that he would devote the rest of his life to the avenging of the murder, and the restoration of his sovereign's son to the throne. In 1650 he landed in the north of Scotland, and marched southwards with his followers, but his career was soon cut short: he was defeated, and taken prisoner to Edinburgh. The covenanters disgraced themselves by the insults which they heaped upon Montrose: he was executed in May, 1650; his head was placed on the prison wall, and the four quarters of his body were stuck up in

¹ Collier, vol. viii., p. 376.

² Russell, vol. ii., p. 225—230.

four of the chief towns. No king had ever a more devoted subject than this brave and faithful hero.¹

The young prince, having no other resource left him, agreed to sign the covenant; he came to Scotland where an army was raised in his cause and landed in June, 1650. Cromwell lost no time in proceeding northwards with his ironsides; the Scots, who under Leslie were encamped near Edinburgh, were defeated at Dunbar, but the general and his covenanters were still formidable. In 1651 the Scots, with Charles II. at their head, marched into England; Cromwell followed, and totally defeated them on September 3rd near Worcester, which battle he was in the habit of calling his "crowning mercy." Charles, now a fugitive, was protected and hidden by a loyalist family of the name of Lane in that neighbourhood, and at length reached the southern coast, and escaped into France. Scotland was placed under the charge of general Monk.

Presbyterianism having thus received a great check, the independents with the army at their back rose to supreme power. In April, 1653, the remnant of the long parliament was ignominiously dismissed. Cromwell marched to the house of commons with three hundred musketeers, and, leaving them outside, entered and took his seat. When he rose to speak, he charged the parliament with oppression and profanity; then, striding up and down, he exclaimed, "Get you gone and give place to honest men." Sir Harry Vane protesting against this proceeding, Cromwell said with a loud voice, "Sir Harry Vane, Sir Harry Vane; the Lord deliver me from Sir Harry Vane." He stamped on the floor, and the musketeers poured in; he then, pointing to the speaker's mace, said, "Take away that bauble." The hall was speedily cleared, and Cromwell locked the door and took the key.

An assembly of about one hundred and forty persons, selected from his warmest supporters, then met; it was called the "Barebones parliament," after a leatherseller who took a leading part in it. It was soon dissolved, and the power all centred in Cromwell, who was elected lord protector by his leading officers in December, 1653. Seated on a throne in Westminster hall, and clothed in royal purple, he was presented with a sword and a Bible. Those who presented him with the latter were too blinded by their prejudices and passions to see that their actions had been little in accordance with its precepts.

In September, 1654, a new house of commons was summoned, and as all royalists were carefully excluded, it was hoped the members would act with the protector. They, however, wished to place limitations on his authority, as it had been entirely derived from military force. This Oliver would not permit, and in January, 1655, the house was dissolved. During this year much smouldering discontent was apparent, which at Salisbury burst into a flame; and though the insurrection was speedily suppressed, Cromwell knew that it was only a symptom of wide-spread hostility to his govern-

¹ Grub, vol. iii., p. 144.

ment. He, therefore, divided England into ten military districts, over each of which he set a major general with strict military power; their expenses were paid by the royalists, on whose incomes ten per cent. was levied by order of the protector. Military rule became continually more extended. Social meetings, at which plans against the government might be discussed, were not allowed. In September, 1656, the protector having engaged in war with Spain, and having exhausted the supplies which he had levied by his own authority, again called a parliament, to which about a hundred members who had been elected were refused admittance, for Oliver would tolerate only such as would support him. With this house, therefore, things proceeded more smoothly. Money was voted, and Cromwell withdrew the major generals. Some changes were now made in the arrangements of the commonwealth. Cromwell was given the right of naming his successor, and a fixed sum was granted for the maintenance of the army and navy. Toleration for "peaceable Christians" was promised, but from this toleration the Church of England and Romanists were strictly excluded. Oliver's parliaments after all were but a mockery, and did not long work amicably with him. He again dissolved the house, and for the rest of his days ruled alone. Cromwell's strength lay in the army which had raised him to his present position.¹

In February, 1654, Usher, archbishop of Armagh, died. At the breaking out of the civil war he was nominated by parliament as one of the "assembly of divines" at Westminster, on account of his Calvinistic views; but he refused the appointment, as he did not allow their authority, and was a warm advocate of episcopacy. Cromwell, when he took the title of lord protector, treated Usher with many marks of esteem. He was individually more tolerant than his followers; but the loyalty of churchmen to their sovereign rendered them obnoxious to him politically, and thus, though toleration was extended to the religious sects, the Church of England was entirely excluded. Some of the last ejected divines desired Usher's influence with the protector for an abatement of the rigour of the law, and the archbishop appealed to him to let them share in the toleration and to be allowed to use the liturgy without being disturbed by the soldiers; this was refused on the ground that "it was not safe to grant liberty of conscience to those men who were declared enemies to his government." Usher was a man of great genius and industry, of an unblemished character,² and the author of a valuable ecclesiastical history.

In 1654 an act was passed establishing a committee called triers, for the examination and approval of public preachers; and before any person could be eligible for a benefice or lectureship, he had to satisfy these triers, who were thirty-eight in number. Their decision was final and absolute, without any cause assigned, but simply not approved. This was in order to exclude all who were sus-

¹ See Gardiner, ch. viii. and ix.

² Collier, vol. viii., p. 391.

pected of a leaning towards the Church of England. A few months later commissioners were chosen in each county to reject "scandalous and ignorant" schoolmasters, which meant those who were loyal to the Church and crown. In 1656 a still more intolerant edict was issued, by which no clergy of the English Church were allowed to be engaged as chaplains or schoolmasters in private families, and thus the last means of sustenance was taken away from the distressed clergy. During this year a positive order was given for the payment of fifths to the sequestered clergy: it had hitherto been a matter of favour, but rarely bestowed, and even now it was clogged with parish charges, taxes, &c., which were very heavy; and one of the conditions of receiving the grant was the removal of the applicant from the parish. The difficulties in the way of obtaining the pittance were very great.

The number of clergy who were ejected from their parishes and from the universities, not including the highest dignitaries of the Church, was upwards of 8000, very many of whom were of great learning and undoubted piety. The presbyterian party had left comparatively little for the independents to do in this respect.¹ Those employed to carry out the various measures enacted against the clergy added to the sufferings of the latter in many instances by the mode in which they carried out their instructions.

The following extracts from the diary of an accomplished writer and layman, John Evelyn, give a lively picture of the persecution. In 1655 he writes, "On Sunday afternoon I frequently stayed at home to catechize and instruct my family, these exercises universally ceasing in the parish churches, so as people had no principles, and grew very ignorant of even the common points of Christianity, all devotion being now placed in hearing sermons." Again, August 3rd, 1656, "I went to London to receive the blessed sacrament, the first time the Church of England was reduced to a chamber and conventicle . . . so sharp was the persecution, ignorant mechanics occupying the pulpits everywhere. Doctor Weld preached in a private house, where we had a great meeting of zealous Christians." "December 25th, 1657, I went to London with my wife to celebrate Christmas day, Mr. Gunning preaching on Micah vii. 2. Sermon ended; as he was giving us the holy sacrament the place was surrounded with soldiers, and all the communicants and assembly kept prisoners by them—some were carried away to the marshal—some to prison. As we went up to receive the communion, the miscreants held their muskets against us as if they would have shot us at the altar, but suffered us to finish the office of communion, as perhaps not having instructions what to do in case they found us in that action."²

During the civil war and the commonwealth an immense number of religious sects had sprung up. If during the time of Laud the

¹ Walker's *Sufferings of the Clergy*, pp. 99, 170, 198. Collier, vol. viii., p. 391.

² See Evelyn's *Diary*.

forms of religion were insisted on too strongly, the total absence of all forms, which afterwards prevailed, led to every fanatic exhibiting his own peculiar views, and each sect setting forth their own feelings on the motions of God's Spirit. We can but name a few of those who made most stir. The fifth-monarchy men, to whom we have already alluded, expected the personal reign of Jesus on earth, during which time they were to become kings and priests; and, acting on the belief that that time had already arrived, they uttered sentiments which were too often blasphemous parodies of Scripture. These people chiefly belonged to the army, and, being soldiers as well as fanatics, were very intolerant of any difference of opinion. The antinomians, who represented indifference to the written law of God, the anabaptists, which at this time included all sects who were adverse to infant baptism, are among some of those who distracted men's minds and injured the Christian religion which they professed to love.¹

The sect of quakers, founded by George Fox, arose during these times. They had no articles or creed to which subscription was required of their members. They rejected water baptism and the Lord's supper as outward ordinances, and objected to the payment of tithes and other ecclesiastical dues, considering that ministers of religion should not receive pay for dispensing spiritual instruction. They refused to take an oath, and disapproved of war or religious persecution, from which latter they themselves suffered considerably. One of their number, James Naylor, was imprisoned at Bristol on the charge of blasphemy, and brought to the bar of the house of commons in 1656, when he was condemned to stand for two hours in the pillory at Westminster, to be whipped from thence to the Old Exchange, then again put in the pillory, his tongue bored through with a hot iron, and his forehead branded with the letter "B."²

A presbyterian writer during the civil war says, "Things every day grow worse and worse. No kind of blasphemy, heresy, disorder, and confusion, but it is found among us or coming in upon us. For we, instead of reformation, are grown from one extreme to another; from popish innovations, superstitions, and prelatical tyranny to damnable heresies, horrid blasphemies, libertinism, and fearful anarchy. . . . Our evils are not removed and cured, but only changed. . . . You have cast out the bishops and their officers, and we have many that cast down all ministers. . . . You have cast out ceremonies in the sacraments, as the cross in baptism and kneeling at the Lord's supper, and we have many who cast out the sacraments. . . . In the bishops' days we had many unlearned ministers, and have we not now a company of Jeroboam's priests? In the bishops' days we had the fourth commandment taken away, but now we have all the commandments taken away by the antinomians. The worst of the prelates held many sound doctrines; yea,

¹ Bishop Short, p. 469.

² Collier, vol. viii., p. 395.

the very papists keep to many articles of faith and have some order; but many of the sects and sectaries in our days deny all principle of religion, and are enemies to all holy duties, order, and learning." This author reckons no less than one hundred and seventy-six heretical and blasphemous tenets maintained by the sectaries, and his book affords a warning to those who would bring about a reform by overturning a settled form of religion.¹

The presbyterian ministers in Scotland had been divided in opinions respecting the proceedings to be adopted during the time of Charles II.'s stay in their country; those who approved of an army being raised for him were called resolutioners, those who condemned it, protestors; which terms continued in use long after the occasion for them had passed away. The protestors, or remonstrants, as they were sometimes called, were republicans in principle, and gained the countenance of Cromwell. They contrived in many cases to obtain the charge of parishes in place of regular ministers, representing those opposed to them as men of depraved habits. Cromwell, however, determined to check the domineering spirit of intolerance by which Scotland had been so long disturbed, and though he granted the presbyterian ministers liberty to discharge their parochial duties, he prohibited them from holding a general assembly. In July, 1653, an attempt was made to do so in defiance of this order; but as they were about to commence proceedings, two officers of the English forces quartered in Edinburgh entered and desired to know by what authority they had met? The moderator, who was not immediately prepared with an answer, was informed that as they had no authority from the English parliament, they had no right to sit. They were then dispersed and marched out of town. On reaching the suburbs, their names and places of residence were inquired into, and they were commanded not to assemble again, or they would incur the penalty of those who disturbed the public peace. About two years later a similar scene took place in a church in Fife, where an assembly of the clergy had met, the military who dispersed them producing no other authority than that of general Monk, who commanded the forces in Scotland. After these high-handed proceedings no further attempt to assemble together was made. There is some excuse for such arbitrary measures in the misuse of authority by these clergy on former occasions, and in their persistent interference in all civil matters; and it is acknowledged by the writers of that time that the strong rule of Cromwell was advantageous to Scotland, which shows that the condition of the country must have been indeed wretched since it was improved by a martial despotism.²

Oliver Cromwell, at the head of the English nation with a victorious army at his command and a navy at his disposal, now that he had conquered the royalists, mastered the English parliament and the

¹ Collier, vol. viii., p. 344, and Edward's *Gangræna*, quoted by him.

² Russell, vol. ii., p. 231—239.

Scottish kirk, and made Ireland submissive, was a ruler to be feared both at home and abroad. The importance of England was raised by victories obtained over the Dutch and the Spaniards, while the protestants in France and in the valleys of the Alps enjoyed through the influence of Cromwell a degree of peace and safety which had been long unknown to them. Cromwell, in fact, gloried in being the protector of the reformed faith on the continent, and was to a certain extent in favour of a general toleration at home; but to Romanists and churchmen he never extended it: to the former because he looked upon the mass as idolatrous, to the latter because he considered them his natural enemies. As regarded the manner in which parishes were attended to during this time, and the state of morals and religion generally, the accounts given by many of the puritan writers are highly favourable; but when we consult the known facts, we find, as may be expected in a period of such religious anarchy, that domestic ties were loosened and the plain dealing and honesty of the people were exchanged for cruelty and cunning. Their minds became restless and unsettled through the falsehoods and misapplications of Scripture employed by those numerous and hot-headed sectaries who each wished to prove that God was on his side; their religious notions became perverted, and too many trusted in predestination and election without bringing forth the necessary fruits of grace.

The majority of the members of the Church of England spent their time in seclusion and under great privations; probably their calm endurance of these trials created a strong reaction towards the Church and king. Many of the opposite party saw the injustice of forbidding persons to use by themselves or in their families such prayers as they preferred. During Cromwell's protectorate the oppression was less severe than it had previously been, for he was not naturally of a persecuting nature. Some of the royalist clergy found retreats in the houses of their friends, where they pursued those studies which consoled them for their present inactivity and prepared them for future usefulness.¹

Cromwell's eventful life was now drawing to a close, and his last years were dark and cloudy. A book called *Killing no Murder*, in which the author advised his assassination, filled him with dread; he constantly carried pistols, and wore a shirt of mail under his clothes. On September 3rd, 1658, the anniversary of the battles of Dunbar and of Worcester, Oliver Cromwell breathed his last. The nonconformist Baxter describes him as beginning his political life from religious motives and collecting round him a band of men actuated by the same principles; but when they gained a superiority they were themselves overcome by their ambition. And as there was much personal danger to them if the king should ever recover his authority, they persuaded themselves they were seeking the good of the kingdom as well as their own in putting him to death; and as Cromwell became involved in difficulties, he had re-

¹ Bishop Short, p. 464.

course to dissimulation, and became selfish.¹ The sagacity of this celebrated man, says dean Hook, gave him a glimpse of that modern toleration which is an honour to our age and a blessing to our country. The same sagacity led him to see that as the country then existed, it must be subjected to the rule of one man; but in becoming that one, he carried out to a certain extent the arbitrary policy for which the king and archbishop had perished on the scaffold.²

We have now concluded one of the most memorable periods in the history of England and her Church; but before turning to other subjects we will add a few remarks on the characters of the two men who ruled her destinies during the last thirty-three years. In the king we saw a scholar and a polished gentleman of unblemished private life, a devoted husband and father, firmly and conscientiously attached to the English Church, with a disposition averse to bloodshed, and whose sovereignty was unstained by those acts of tyranny which sent so many persons to the scaffold in the reigns of his immediate predecessors. But as a monarch whose lot was cast in such unsettled times, his great indecision of mind, which left him to be swayed by the opinions of those whose judgment was inferior to his own; his want of that foresight which alone could tell him when to yield with grace or resist with firmness, together with those high notions of his prerogative and the divine right of kings which he inherited from his predecessors, led him into inextricable difficulties. The one great stain upon his character was setting his hand to the death warrant of Strafford. The fault of which he has been most generally accused was a want of sincerity in his manner of dealing with those to whom he was opposed, making promises which he did not fulfil, and protestations to which he did not adhere; neither is it denied by his adherents that in the straits to which he was reduced, he occasionally employed towards his enemies those weapons of casuistry with which he was assailed.

Oliver Cromwell was the very opposite of Charles. Great decision and energy were his distinguishing characteristics. His foresight led him to see events in the distance, and to shape his course accordingly. With great military genius, he was dexterous in reading the characters of men and in taking advantage of their weaknesses. By his admirers he is represented as having possessed the highest virtue and talent; on the other side he has been represented as a consummate hypocrite.

“A man who stole the livery
Of the court of heaven to serve
The devil in.”

POLLOK.

None can deny that he made use of religion as a convenient stepping-stone to power; but he found, as all usurpers do, that his

¹ Bishop Short, p. 451, quoting Baxter.

² Dean Hook, vol. vi., p. 357.

anxieties and difficulties increased with that power. All must acknowledge that he was a warm friend and protector of the reformed religion on the continent, and that he raised the influence of England to a high position in the eyes of Europe.

During the commencement of this period the speeches of many members of the house of commons would have done credit to any age, both in learning and patriotism; and we cannot imagine such men as Pym, Hampden, and Vane to have been actuated by any other motives than a desire to see their country brought to a state of freedom. But, unhappily, when a country passes through such a crisis in Church and state as England did during the days of Charles I. and Cromwell, men's passions become heated, those who were oppressed become oppressors, until at length freedom is crushed beneath a military despotism.

We have entered somewhat fully into the persecuting spirit displayed by the presbyterians and independents, and the sufferings of the clergy, because in the popular histories of the present day the intolerance of the Church and the arbitrary conduct of Charles, the greatness of Cromwell, and the benefits conferred on the country by his rule, are usually brought so prominently forward as to make it appear that the English Church was the great engine of persecution, the puritans and covenanters the only sufferers, and the king the only ruler who was arbitrary or tyrannical. And we have endeavoured to state facts as they occurred, without screening the faults and intolerant proceedings of either the king, the long parliament, or Cromwell, of whom each in their turn committed the errors charged on their predecessors. If Charles endeavoured to force the doctrines and government of the English Church upon his Scottish subjects, they in their turn endeavoured to force their system of presbyterianism upon the English people, and punished those of their own countrymen who refused to sign the covenant; while the long parliament set up committees in almost every county, which were little centres of tyranny for oppressing the laity and sequestrating the livings of the clergy, when they dared to hold opinions which the parliament disapproved.

We cannot conclude this troubled era in our country's history better than by quoting the words of one of our most learned and excellent modern prelates. Speaking of the puritans generally and of the influence of the Calvinistic opinions amongst them, he says, "There was much that was noble and spirited in their sturdy independence; in their resistance to tyranny, whether civil or ecclesiastical; in their stern, simple habits of life and faith. But they were as intolerant as those to whom they were opposed, whether papists or Anglicans. People had not learned at that time that it was possible to tolerate either doctrines or practices without wholly agreeing with them."¹

Oliver Cromwell was succeeded as protector by his eldest son

¹ See *A Pastoral Letter*, by Ed. Harold, bishop of Winchester, 1876, p. 11.
Published by Longmans.

Richard, and in January, 1659, a parliament was called. But Richard, who was a peaceable and retiring man, was totally unfit for such a position. In April the parliament was dissolved; Richard resigned his office and led a quiet country life, which he enjoyed to extreme old age. A few independents, who had been members of the long parliament when Cromwell expelled it in 1653, then took their seats in the house of commons under the protection of the army, Lenthall being again their speaker. It now seemed as if the country was to fall entirely into the hands of a military despotism; but disunion in the army and an increasing royalist feeling in the land saved it. Cavaliers and presbyterians began to forget their enmity in their desire to obtain a settled government; and towards the end of 1659 some of the leading divines of the latter party in London assisted the progress of events by stirring up in their congregations a desire for the return of the king.

CHAPTER XXX.

CENTURY XVII.

FROM THE RESTORATION, MAY, 1660, TO THE DEATH OF
CHARLES II., 1685.

GENERAL MONK, who commanded the forces in Scotland, marched southwards, with 7000 men, and reached London February, 1660. The nation waited with anxiety to see what course he would take; and Monk, who had been in secret communication with Charles, called the two houses of parliament together. The hearts of both parliament and people were now leaning towards their exiled sovereign; and when Monk announced in parliament that a messenger from the king had arrived, the news was joyfully received, and a warm invitation was sent to his majesty to return to his native land. In his celebrated address, called *The Declaration of Breda*, Charles said, in reference to religion, "The passions and prejudices of the times have produced several opinions in religion by which men are engaged in parties and animosities against each other. . . . We do declare a liberty to tender consciences, and that no man shall be disquieted, or called in question for differences of opinion on matters of religion which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom, and that we shall be ready to consent to such an act of parliament as upon mature consideration shall be offered to us for the full granting that indulgence."¹ Commissioners were sent from the houses of lords and commons to the Hague conveying a formal invitation to their king to return, and with them were eight or ten presbyterian divines, Reynolds, Calamy, and others. These urged upon the king that, as the Common Prayer had long been discontinued in England, and many of the people had never even heard it, the revival of its use in his own chapel would be a cause of much wonder, and so they begged of him not to use the whole form but only some parts of the service. The king replied that as he gave them liberty, he should by no means resign his own, and that he was resolved to suffer no other public devotion in his own chapel; and he told them plainly that he would not be restrained himself where others had so much liberty.²

Shortly after this Charles II. arrived in England, landing at Dover on May 26th, 1660. The route from Rochester to London was crowded with such a multitude of people that it seemed as if it was one continued street. The army, consisting of 50,000 men, was drawn up on Blackheath, and its chief officers were presented to the king by general Monk. On the 29th he entered London, where the joy of the people was so universal that Charles observed

¹ Clarendon, b. xvi., p. 900.

² Ibid., b. xvi., p. 909.

to some about him "he doubted it had been his own fault that he had been absent so long."¹

To mark the king's sense of the conduct of the presbyterians, ten or twelve of their leading divines were made chaplains in ordinary to his majesty; amongst them Reynolds, Baxter, and Calamy, well known names. The hopes of their party were raised by the portion of the king's declaration which we have quoted. They had also actual possession of the churches in many places, and were favoured by some great men. Soon after the restoration they had an audience of the king, and in their address to him they recommended that the kingdom should be united in the matter of religion. The king expressed his pleasure at their desire for union, but told them that could not be expected without something of concession on both sides, and asked them to write down their proposals;² but the points they required to be altered were so numerous that archbishop Parker would not have recognized the reformed Church of England. The bishops on their part sent in their answer to the proposals of the presbyterians.

In consequence of this controversy a second *Declaration* was sent forth to the king's loving subjects in England and Wales. In it Charles says, that as exceptions were taken against several things in the liturgy, an equal number of divines on both sides should be appointed to revise the same and make such alterations as should be thought necessary.

Nine of the bishops who had survived the civil war recovered their sees at the restoration, and Juxon, bishop of London, who had attended the martyred king in his last hours, was made archbishop of Canterbury. The merits and piety of Reynolds, Baxter, and Calamy were recognized by the offer of the bishoprics of Norwich, Hereford, and Lichfield. Reynolds accepted that of Norwich, but the other two declined the intended honour.³

A commission now issued whereby twelve of the bishops and twelve of the presbyterian divines were appointed to consider the objections raised and to make such reasonable and necessary alterations as they should jointly agree upon. This meeting was called the Savoy conference, from the name of the place where it was held. Of the objections, eighteen in number, some were the same as had been brought forward at the Hampton-court conference, some were frivolous, and others were such as it would have been well had some concession been agreed to. Additions were also proposed; but what perhaps rendered any revision unacceptable to churchmen was an act of Baxter, who drew up a liturgy of his own and styled it the 'reformed liturgy.' In proposing to substitute this composition for that which had been compiled by learned divines and martyrs of the Church, and much of which was taken from very ancient liturgies, there was a certain amount of presumption. It

¹ Clarendon, b. xvi., p. 910.

² Berens, p. 124. Collier, vol. viii., p. 400—402.

³ Collier, vol. viii., p. 407. Berens, p. 134.

seemed an attempt to impose on English churchmen a new form of prayer drawn up by one man, when the conference had met merely to review the Common Prayer and to make "reasonable alterations." After much disputing and heart-burning nothing was agreed upon, and it may be doubted how far either party was in earnest in their desire for union. From the tone of both it seemed as if they wished the concessions to come from their opponents. This want of conciliation on both sides is much to be lamented, and the spirit with which Baxter, worthy as he was, carried on his part of the dispute, did not assist agreement. The remembrance also of the events with which both presbyterians and independents had been connected during the reign of Charles I. still rankled in the minds of the royalists, who had suffered so recently and so severely in their sovereign's cause.¹

Sheldon, who had succeeded Juxon as bishop of London, took an active part at the conference. He clearly understood that though the presbyterians did not ask for the establishment of presbyterianism, they desired what Baxter called a reduced episcopacy—that is presbyterianism under another form. The conference on breaking up agreed that the following report should be sent to the king in writing:—"That the Church's welfare, that unity and peace and his majesty's satisfaction were ends upon which they were all agreed; but as to the means thereto they could not come to any harmony."

Whilst the conference was sitting, a parliament was summoned, and one of its first acts touching the Church was to restore the bishops to their seats in the house of lords. Convocation also met in May, 1661. The few alterations agreed upon at the Savoy conference were mostly adopted and some further concessions made to the presbyterians with a few other changes and additions. The principal additions were the collects for the ember weeks, the prayer for the high court of parliament, and that for all sorts and conditions of men, and the general thanksgiving, and forms of prayer to be used at sea, together with an "office of baptism for those of riper years," which was rendered necessary by the number of persons found to be unbaptized in consequence of the distracted state of religion during the late disturbances. Thus altered, the Book of Common Prayer passed convocation, received the sanction of parliament and the royal assent May 19th, 1662. In the preface, which was at this time inserted and is generally supposed to have been written by bishop Sanderson, the reasons for the alterations made are clearly set forth. Thus was the liturgy re-established, and after its then complete revision it has continued ever since to be the instructor, the guide, and the consolation of all true and faithful sons and daughters of the Church of England.²

The bishops were now fully employed in endeavouring to repair the ruins caused by the havoc of the previous years, and to bring

¹ See Bishop Short, p. 489—501. Also Berens, p. 136—154.

² Collier, vol. viii., p. 443. Dean Hook, vol. vi., p. 428. Berens, p. 155—161.

their dioceses into something like order. Cathedrals, churches, and clergy houses had to be repaired and rebuilt, and libraries in some degree to be recovered.¹

It has been stated in a former chapter that the clergy when assembled in convocation voted their own taxes or subsidies towards the support of the state; this they had continued to do until the rebellion; but when the nonconformists had the ascendancy, the ministers had their benefices taxed in parliament where the laity were taxed. On the restoration of the monarchy this ancient right of the Church was restored to convocation, and continued for three years, their grant of four subsidies being confirmed by parliament. But after this some of the bishops and clergy considered the system of taxing themselves somewhat burdensome, and thought it possible also that the court might expect too much, and parliament be discontented unless they gave more than their reasonable proportion; and so, after some consultation with lord chancellor Clarendon and the archbishop of Canterbury, it was decided that the clergy should give up their ancient right of taxing themselves, and suffer the amount to be included in the money vote of the house of commons. It does not seem very certain that the clergy were gainers by this change. The crown no longer depended upon their assembling in convocation for their subsidies, and it was therefore probable that the Church synods would be less regularly convened and less regarded when they had any grievances to set forth.²

The choice of bishop Juxon for the archbishopric of Canterbury had been very judicious, for in spite of his age and infirmities his intellect was as yet unimpaired, and the royalists would have been deeply hurt if he who stood by the first Charles in his martyrdom had not placed the crown on the head of his son and successor. During his primacy Juxon augmented the vicarages appropriated to his see and spent a large sum on repairs. His death took place in June, 1663: he was buried in the chapel of St. John's college, Oxford, but his desire that his funeral should be conducted without pomp was disregarded by his nephew. Sheldon, bishop of London, succeeded to the archbishopric, having assisted Juxon in his labours during the latter part of his primacy.³

In May, 1662, the act of uniformity was passed, which required all ministers to declare before the 24th of August their "unfeigned assent and consent" to the Book of Common Prayer, and to receive episcopal ordination, before they could hold a benefice or administer the sacrament of the Lord's supper; neither could any be received as a lecturer or permitted to preach in any church or chapel unless licensed by the bishop. All heads of colleges, &c., were required before the 24th day of August to abjure the *Solemn League and Covenant* and the claim to take up arms against the king, and to

¹ Blunt's *Handbook*, p. 100.

² Collier, vol. viii., p. 463—466.

³ Dean Hook, vol. vi., p. 423—436.

conform to the liturgy of the Church of England. The tendency of the act was to exclude from ministering in the Church all who were not friendly to her whole constitution.¹

Much stress has been laid upon the severity of the act of uniformity and of the consequent secession of ministers from the livings which they then held. The number of these was set down at two thousand, but it is now well ascertained that they were not so numerous. In most places the return to the Church services was welcomed. Many of the puritan clergy conformed altogether, and of those who did not do so some were satisfied to return into lay communion without leaving the Church. The restoration of the surviving clergy who had been unjustly deprived by the long parliament would necessarily eject the newer holders of those benefices whether by an act of uniformity or any other process; and with regard to these newer possessors the question was well asked a few years since, "How did they get there?" How did these persons, many of whom had not received any sort of ordination, come into possession of the endowments and houses of the clergy? Was it not by turning out the original holders? This question should be well considered before a charge of cruelty and injustice is brought against the English Church in this matter. It would have been against the principles and order of our Church to have those ministering within her who were hostile to her rules and ordinances; and no church can flourish whose officiating ministers are unfriendly to the details of her services. We deplore the loss of those who left at that time, for amongst them were many of undoubted piety and some possessed of extraordinary ability; but they had no legal right to those benefices which they gave up on St. Bartholomew's day, 1662.² Although by the act of uniformity many of the clergy were restored to their rights, many who had been ejected were dead, having sunk under the hardships they had endured, and some did not seek to return to their former homes. The question naturally arose, what should be done with the rest of the ministers who were in possession? It must be remembered that the Church of England holds episcopal ordination to be of apostolic origin. She must therefore have either waived this qualification in favour of those nonconformist ministers, or have arranged for their episcopal ordination. Looking at the matter as we now do in the more tolerant light of the present time, we wish that many had been permitted to remain; and though a church principle would thereby have been sacrificed, the peculiar circumstances might have justified this, and they would have been succeeded on their death by those who had received episcopal ordination. The secession of these ministers was a calamity, but it must be remembered that during the previous years from seven to eight thousand English clergymen, for refusing to take the covenant, had been ejected from

¹ See *Life of Clarendon*, p. 1075—1082.

² See Bishop Short, p. 506—516. Also *How did they get there?* by the Rev. George Venables, vicar of Great Yarmouth, pp. 6, 21.

their livings with much greater cruelty and injustice.¹ Clarendon says that the presbyterians inveighed against the Book of Common Prayer and the episcopal government of the Church as they had done before the king returned, and the other sects did the same, and the anabaptists and quakers made as much noise as ever, and that all this offended the parliament very much and made them desire that the act of uniformity should be published without delay.² It is necessary to study the subject impartially, and to read history from both points of view, in order to see how unjust is the accusation of church intolerance, and how one sided is the admiration of non-conformist sufferers for conscience sake, while the treatment of those clergy who suffered yet more unjustly, more severely, and more numerous, and who bore their sufferings with exemplary patience and resignation, is forgotten.

As soon as the seceders had left their benefices, they took steps for publishing a list of those who had departed, together with an account of their hardships, and it was not until then that a record of the usage which the deprived clergy had received from the long parliament was collected by the author from whom we have quoted.³

The restoration parliament, as it has been called, which passed the various acts mentioned, was in truth more high church than the country generally. The long parliament, on the other hand, was more presbyterian than the country. Such is the chance of representative government in free states. There is always a risk of the elections occurring when some paroxysm of strong feeling possesses the electors, and then the members chosen may continue to pass measures for which the country in its permanent thoughts and feelings is not prepared. The long parliament was elected while England was incensed against archbishop Laud, and had resolved that the Scots might be as presbyterian as they pleased provided presbyterianism was confined to the heaths and mountains of the north. Accordingly a much larger proportion of presbyterians and puritans found seats in the long parliament than corresponded to those parties in English society. In like manner the restoration parliament was elected to secure the stability of the crown and the Church, and its high-church feeling was above the average of that of the country generally. Hence there was a good deal in the proceedings of both assemblies which has not been ratified by the deliberate judgment of England. The lord chancellor Clarendon, who possessed much influence in the early part of this reign, seems at first to have wished to conciliate the enemies of the monarchy both in Church and state; but when he came to act, he found their characters very dissimilar. The republican statesmen were in many cases willing to agree to the measures required by the altered state of the kingdom, but the nonconformists would make no allowance

¹ Venables, *How did they get there?* p. 22.

² *Life of Clarendon*, p. 1075.

³ Walker's *Sufferings of the Clergy*.

for the opinions of others, and would concede nothing. Mankind had not then learnt, nor could they know, the benefits of toleration.¹

In 1661 the corporation act was passed by parliament, which precluded Romanists and other nonconformists from occupying any municipal office; the oaths of allegiance and supremacy being required, together with the reception of the Lord's supper according to the rites of the Church of England. The numerous plots, real or imaginary, which from time to time were coming to light, and one of which was the work of some of the fifth-monarchy men, threw London into a state of alarm, and were the cause of the passing of the conventicle act in 1664. This forbade more than five people above sixteen years of age (besides the residents) assembling in any house for religious worship, upon pain of fines or imprisonment. It was intended to guard against persons assembling under a religious pretext to plot against the government, and was probably thought necessary on account of the danger to Church and state from the anabaptists, Romanists, and disaffected members of Cromwell's army. The five-mile act in 1665 prohibited nonconformist ministers, under a penalty, from coming within five miles of any town where they had been ministers unless they took the required oath "not to take up arms against the king on any pretence." These acts did not however pass through parliament without attempts being made to lessen their severity, and they naturally lead us to sympathize with those against whom they were exercised; but the readiness with which the nonconformists had broken the unity of the Church and the persistency with which they set up separate congregations cannot be approved. Such a spirit of division has been the result that the true meaning of the word schism is now scarcely realized, and it is scarcely understood or looked upon as a sin.

Many of these laws pressed with equal severity upon the Roman catholics, who had increased in number and were well pleased to see the various nonconformist bodies united against the Church of England. The result of the unhappy choice of a Romanist queen by Charles I. was now shown, as not only was Charles II. suspected of a preference for Romanism, but the next heir to the throne, the duke of York, was an avowed and bigoted member of that communion. It was indeed believed that the king secretly belonged to the Romish Church. These combined circumstances caused his desire for toleration to be extremely unpopular. Parliament absolutely refused to sanction the king's proposal that he should be permitted to dispense with the act of uniformity at pleasure, and even the nonconformists opposed it. In 1672 the test act was passed, which required from all persons in office, both civil and military, not only the reception of the Lord's supper, but likewise a declaration against transubstantiation. Upon the passing of this act the duke of York retired from the command of the navy. The lord chancellor Clarendon, with the aid of the bishops, defeated a

¹ Bishop Short, p. 533.

bill brought into the house of lords for enabling the king to sell toleration at a certain yearly payment; and it is said that this display of independence on the part of Clarendon was never forgiven by the monarch. On the last attempt in 1671, when the king issued a declaration of indulgence, parliament first remonstrated warmly, and at last expressed its dislike to the declaration with so much vigour that Charles was obliged to withdraw it.¹ It must be remembered that the test act was especially directed against the Romanists, though it also pressed hardly on the protestant nonconformists, and parliament objected to the toleration proposed by Charles II., because it dreaded the result of increased liberty to Romanists. The same objection for the same reason applied to the dispensing power claimed by Charles's successor.

In November, 1676, Sheldon, archbishop of Canterbury, died, and was succeeded by doctor William Sancroft, dean of St. Paul's. Dr. Hacket, whose courage and resolution we named in a previous chapter, became bishop of Lincoln after the restoration. Previously to his elevation to the episcopate, he occupied one of the principal churches in London; and on one occasion a deceased nonconformist who had been noted for his hostility to the Church was brought thither for burial. Dr. Hacket, knowing that the friends and relations of the deceased had been very averse to the Common Prayer, and had avoided all occasions of being acquainted with it, adopted the following expedient to give them satisfaction and convince them of the unreasonableness of their objections. Before the day appointed for the funeral he learnt the burial office by heart, and when the persons assembled heard him deliver all without a book with great readiness and composure, they were much surprised and affected, and declared they had never heard a more suitable or edifying exercise even from the best men of their own persuasion. But they were still more surprised when doctor Hacket showed them that the office had been taken word for word out of what they had looked upon as the poor contemptible Book of Common Prayer.²

The plot which caused the greatest agitation in the country was that with which the name of Titus Oates is connected. He stated that he had been engaged with Romanists both at home and abroad in a design to establish popery and assassinate the king. Many Roman catholics suffered death upon these accusations, but in those times perjury was unhappily by no means uncommon, and it is now much doubted if the plot ever existed. The belief in this conspiracy caused an act to be passed which excluded Roman catholics from both houses of parliament, as the oaths of allegiance and supremacy and a declaration against transubstantiation, &c., were required before they could sit or vote in either house. The duke of York was excepted from the operation of this act.¹ It was pro-

¹ Bishop Short, p. 516—524. Collier, vol. viii., p. 472—476. *Life of Clarendon*, p. 1129.

² Plume's *Life of Bishop Hacket*, edited by the Rev. Mackenzie Walcott, p. 65.

posed to exclude him from the succession to the throne on account of his religion; this bill was not carried and was opposed by the bishops in the house of lords, for although they were not insensible to their danger from a popish sovereign, they considered it inconsistent with their duty as loyal subjects to change the succession. About this time the nick-names of whig and tory were first employed.

Two great calamities occurred in this reign; the plague in 1665, and the great fire of London the following year, when as many as eighty-nine churches were destroyed; and though the loss of life on the latter occasion was not so great as might have been expected, the destruction of property was immense.

During the plague 3000 persons were carried off in London alone, and the disease extended to various parts of the country. Amongst other places it was conveyed through some woollen goods to the parish of Eyam, in Derbyshire, which we mention on account of the Christian courage and devotedness of the clergyman of Eyam, the Rev. W. Mompesson. He collected the inhabitants together, and pointed out to them the duty of remaining within the bounds of their own parish, and thus preventing the spread of the pestilence, and stated his own determination to abide at his post. His wife, though in delicate health, would not leave her husband at this trying time. Mr. Mompesson wrote to the earl of Devonshire at Chatsworth, telling him that if a fixed supply of provisions could be regularly furnished for their support none would go beyond the boundary, or leave what then appeared to be a place devoted to destruction. His proposal was complied with. The earl remained in the neighbourhood and superintended the supplies of food which were daily brought to certain spots on the hills around; troughs were placed which were filled with water to receive and purify the money given in exchange. The small stream which supplied this water was long known by the name of Mompesson's brook. The inhabitants faithfully obeyed the charge of their rector, and it is remarkable that when the pestilence became most terrible, not a single person attempted to pass the bounds. This devoted minister suspended the services in the church, and assembled his people in the open air in a grassy dingle, where he seated them at certain distances from each other, while from a rock above he read the services of the Church and preached. How solemn must have been his exhortations in those fearful days. The rock is still shown to the visitor, and called Cucklet church to this day. The ranks of the flock were rapidly thinned, and Mrs. Mompesson died of the pestilence in her husband's arms in the 27th year of her age. Her monument may still be seen in Eyam church. The devotion and fortitude of Mr. Mompesson and his parishioners were rewarded, for the disease spread no further. This excellent man survived till 1708.¹

¹ Bishop Short, p. 524.

² Life of Rev. W. Mompesson, in *Lives of Englishmen*.

When the restoration of Charles II. became probable, the Scotch presbyterians (both resolutionists and remonstrants) laid before him a statement of their wishes. The former were represented by Mr. James Sharp, a leading man amongst the moderate party, who was afterwards archbishop of St. Andrews. In August, 1660, the exercise of the royal government was resumed. A letter was addressed by the king to Robert Douglas, one of the leading presbyterian ministers, in which certain expressions were supposed by that party to promise that presbyterianism should be continued. In January, 1661, the Scotch parliament met, and the king, with its advice and consent, forbade his northern subjects upon any pretence whatever to renew the league and covenant or any other covenant concerning the government of the Church or kingdom without his consent.¹

The right of patrons to present to vacant churches, which had been taken away in 1649, was now restored to them with the caution that they should present only "such as are of a pious and peaceable disposition, and who shall take the oath of allegiance before they receive the presentation," which was a very reasonable caution. The synod of Aberdeen drew up an address to the king and parliament, praying that the government of "this rent church may be settled according to the word of God and the practice of the ancient primitive church in such a way as may conduce for godliness, unity, peace, and order." Before deciding, Charles wished to consult the Scottish nobles and clergy, and accordingly the two leading ministers, Douglas and Sharp, were summoned to London; but the former from age and illness could not attend. Sharp had already been made a royal chaplain, and professor at St. Andrews. A council was convened at Whitehall, and after some discussion a proclamation was issued declaring that "the government of the Church by archbishops and bishops would be restored as it stood settled in the year 1637." It is said that Sharp, who returned to Edinburgh in August, 1661, was authorized by the king to make offers of preferment to the most loyal and influential preachers, and particularly to Mr. Douglas. The latter declined on account of his acts in former times, and his present age and infirmities; but told Sharp, if he was disposed to comply with episcopacy, he neither could nor would blame him. We have said that there were two parties amongst the Scotch presbyterians: the loyal and moderate, who do not appear to have been averse to a modified form of episcopacy, and that more violent and republican portion of whom we have spoken in a former chapter under the name of protesters or remonstrants. This party had supported Cromwell, but even under his rule were not sufficiently amenable to discipline; and on one occasion he told them that they had the same privileges as the presbyterian clergy in England, who had liberty to preach the gospel, but not to rail, nor under pretence of expounding Scrip-

¹ Collier, vol. viii., p. 447.

ture to overtop the civil power and abuse it as they pleased.¹ Some of the remonstrants were at this time considered to use language which was treasonable.

As all the Scotch prelates expelled in 1638 had with one exception died, it became necessary to appoint others; and in December, 1661, Sharp, Fairford, Hamilton, and Leighton were respectively consecrated to the sees of St. Andrews, Glasgow, Galloway, and Dunblane, by the bishops of London, Winchester, and other prelates, in Westminster abbey. The episcopal Church of Scotland, which has continued to exist to the present day, has descended from these bishops, and the episcopal succession has not since been interrupted. The Scotch parliament which met again in May, 1662, confirmed these acts with other statutes bearing on the same subject.² The re-establishment of episcopacy in Scotland by Charles II. was in a great degree dictated by political motives. He and his advisers considered it better calculated to preserve tranquility and decorum, and it was hoped that the pulpit would no longer be employed for purposes of political disturbances or personal abuse, and that the ministers under episcopal supervision would confine themselves to their duty as teachers of God's word. The Church now re-established was so desirous to avoid hurting the presbyterian consciences by her ceremonial that she deviated but little from their form of worship. The moderate presbyterians attended the services and received the communion in the episcopal churches. Neither were the incomes appointed for the prelates and inferior clergy open to any objection on the ground of extravagance.

Mr. Calamy, when he heard the easy terms on which those of his persuasion might hold communion with the national Church, exclaimed, "What would our brethren be at, or what would they have?" But there was unfortunately still amongst the Scotch clergy a considerable party who were hostile to the views of both king and parliament. The remonstrants mourned over the covenant; and in Scotland, so long torn by angry passions in religion and politics, it was scarcely possible to raise fourteen persons to the office of bishop without giving occasion to charges of apostacy and desertion. Sharp, from his position and influence, was especially exposed to this, and it has been said by hostile writers that the persons chosen as prelates

¹ See Russell, vol. ii., p. 234. ² See Grub, vol. iii., ch. lxiii.

The other sees were as follows :—

Edinburgh	Argyle	Dunkeld
Aberdeen	Ross	Moray
Brechin	Caithness	Orkney
	and the Isles.	

In point of antiquity the first Scottish diocese was Galloway or Candida Casa; the second probably that of St. Mungo or Glasgow; the third that of St. Andrews. When Alexander III. recovered the western islands from the king of Norway about 1240, he formed them into a bishopric. The bishop of the isles fixed his seat at Iona. *History of St. Andrews*, by the Rev. C. J. Lyon, M.A., vol. i., pp. 32, 115.

were unfit for their office. Burnet, however, who knew them well, remarks that he had "observed among them as great and exemplary things as are to be met with in all ecclesiastical history." There is nothing more remarkable amongst the rigid covenanters than their disposition to slander those opposed to them, and this not with respect to episcopalians only, for during the commonwealth the remonstrants had described the presbyterians of the more loyal class as "men of depraved habits." In fact, the spirit of the solemn league and covenant was not yet extinct. There was a love of liberty, but it was liberty of a one-sided kind: it amounted only to a wish to be free from all restraint themselves, and to have the privilege of imposing restraint upon others. Toleration was still considered by this party an offence to God and a positive injury to his Church.

We have stated that parliament had restored to patrons of livings the right of presentation. But the act necessarily declared that no incumbent who had been appointed since the abolition of patronage in 1638 had any legal right to his benefice. With a view of dealing tenderly with these persons, it was provided that all pastors who should obtain presentations from the patrons should be continued in their livings, if they were collated by the bishops of their respective dioceses. In most parts of the country no inconvenience resulted, but in the south-western districts, where the ministers were more rigid and unbending, a great number resolved to give up their parochial duties rather than comply with the dictate of the civil power. An order was therefore issued by the Scotch privy council forbidding those ministers to perform any duty in their parishes, declaring their places vacant, and desiring the people not to attend their services. Archbishop Sharp is said to have disapproved of this step, and it is certain that Christian wisdom was not consulted in it. It was thought that this would cause the refractory ministers to submit, but this was not the case, and two hundred of them resigned their livings rather than have their appointment confirmed by the deed of a bishop.

Bishop Burnet mentions that the incumbents in these counties were chiefly protesters or remonstrants with a scanty measure of learning, apt to censure all who differed from them and to believe and report whatsoever they heard to their prejudice; and he adds that their readiness to stir up the people to tumults caused an ill opinion to be formed of them at this time. The persons appointed to fill their places were not kindly received by the parishioners, and those who left took up the position of suffering for conscience sake, although they might have continued in their places on very easy conditions. But, by the account of a presbyterian writer of credit, they were a class of men whom no forbearance could conciliate. They, however, resolved not to leave the neighbourhood of their former churches, but to remain and hold meetings in private houses or in the open air; and thus the new incumbents were received generally with hostility and affronts. In 1663 the Scotch parliament passed an act against separation, and disobedience to authority,

and required persons to attend their parish churches, enacting penalties for such as did not comply. A court of high commission was formed, which acted with much severity; but it was not long allowed to continue, as the king issued orders that it should be dissolved. It was not to be expected that a class of religionists who had been long accustomed to do what was right in their own eyes, and to set the civil power at defiance, and who still looked upon the covenant as of equal force with the gospel, would submit to any restraint. The assemblies took place in the fields or in houses, and they were prepared to meet force by force. An insurrection ensued, but it was checked, and the severities which followed did little honour to the clemency or the wisdom of government, although those who were executed would have been pardoned had they consented to renounce the covenant which had proved a bond of sedition and a source of rebellion. The leaders of the movement were suspected of having carried on a treasonable correspondence with the United provinces, with whom England was then at war.

Terms were now offered: a complete indemnity to all the insurgents if they would sign a "bond of peace," which only required a promise of obedience to the civil authority, and it was proposed to grant an indulgence to the more moderate of the deprived ministers, which was arranged in 1669. Several were thus restored to their office, but this displeased the more violent adherents of the covenant who, because the former confined their teaching to gospel truths and avoided politics, called them traitors, king's curates, and dumb dogs. Leighton, who was now archbishop of Glasgow, endeavoured to induce these western fanatics to give way, but they shut their ears to all accommodation, and thus lost the sympathy of many.

It is beyond the limits of this work to follow all the events of this unhappy contest, which was carried on with desperate constancy by the infatuated and ignorant peasantry under fanatical leaders, who were urged by severity into actual rebellion. In May, 1679, archbishop Sharp, when returning from Edinburgh to St. Andrews, was waylaid at Magus Moor, near the latter city, and barbarously murdered in the presence of his daughter who was in the coach with him. An attempt had been formerly made upon his life in Edinburgh, when the bishop of Orkney who was with him received a severe wound. The assassination was extolled by the violent party, for the blind zeal of the covenanters led them even in their sermons to recommend the slaughter of those whom they considered as the enemies of true piety.

The see of St. Andrews is one of the most ancient in Scotland. After Kenneth II. vanquished the Picts in the ninth century, the Scots made St. Andrews the seat of a bishopric and the ecclesiastical metropolis of their kingdom. Before that time Abernethy had been the chief town of the southern Picts. The cathedral of St. Andrews occupied one hundred and fifty years in building, under various bishops. It was consecrated in 1318, in the presence of king Robert Bruce. This noble structure and the ecclesiastical

buildings around it were demolished in 1559,¹ during the period when Knox and his followers were rousing the populace to those acts of destruction. The beautiful ruins are now well cared for.²

The murder of archbishop Sharp caused the law against conventicles to be enforced still more vigorously, and on their part the covenanters met in larger bodies and carried arms for their defence, till on the 29th of May, the anniversary of the restoration, they collected together at a place in Lanarkshire, where they set forth a declaration against prelacy, and burned all those acts of parliament as well as those of the council which had established that form of Church government and had prohibited field preachings. Captain Graham of Claverhouse, afterwards viscount Dundee, attacked a party of these insurgents at Loudon-hill, but was repulsed. Encouraged by their success, they proceeded to Glasgow and announced that they were fighting against the king's supremacy, against popery and prelacy, and a popish successor. The distinction between resolutioners and remonstrants had now ceased; but the lawfulness of accepting the indulgence still divided the presbyterians into two parties, those who rejected it becoming more and more republican. The more violent covenanters became known as the Cameronians, from the name of a preacher, Richard Cameron. Their principles were set forth in June, 1680, in a declaration wherein they disclaimed the authority of Charles Stuart, and declared war against him as a tyrant and usurper. Charles now sent the duke of Monmouth against the rebels who subdued them at Bothwell bridge. Those who were taken prisoners were liberated on their promise to live peaceably, but about two hundred, who refused this condition, were shipped off to the colonies. Two of the ministers who were taken with arms in their hands were executed. Had the measures adopted been throughout more lenient, the poor ignorant people would, perhaps, have been less extravagant. No government could have tolerated their frantic proceedings, but the severities inflicted on them exceeded the offence and aroused a more stubborn resistance; and fanaticism opposed by violence and cruelty produced, as is always the case, a melancholy result.³

Ireland presented to the government of Charles II. a most difficult task. It has been justly remarked by the author from whom we quote⁴ that to the holders of land forfeiture of the possession is the appropriate punishment for a treasonable use of its influence.

¹ *History of St. Andrews*, by the Rev. C. J. Lyon, M.A., vol. i., pp. 25, 158.

² St. Andrews possesses an additional interest as having been the site of a monastery of the Culdees, which was built on rising ground east of the cathedral, where the foundation of a portion of this ancient structure is still to be seen. The Culdees were gradually superseded in Scotland by the Romish order of monks. They appear to have had originally the privilege of electing the bishops, who, as in England, exercised their functions long before dioceses were marked out. The Culdees gradually lost this privilege, and from the year 1298 ceased to have any existence as an independent body.—See *History of St. Andrews*, by the Rev. C. J. Lyon, M.A., vol. i., pp. 26, 33, 34.

³ See Russell, vol. ii., p. 256—308. Grub, vol. iii., pp. 157, 261.

⁴ Froude's *English in Ireland*, vol. i., p. 130.

Two centuries ago the owner of the soil was the guide of his tenant's allegiance, the natural governor (under the supreme authority of the state) of hundreds of human beings. If the owner was false to his trust, the sovereign power resumed its rights, and sold or gave his land and authority to those who would more faithfully discharge their duties. This had been the case in Ireland in the reign of James I., and the lands forfeited in Ulster had been colonized by settlers from Scotland. The firm but severe rule of Strafford had done much to give peace and order to Ireland; her manufactures improved, her commerce extended, but the unhappy state of affairs of England deprived the country of this excellent ruler; then came the terrible massacre of 1641, and when England had leisure to attend again to Irish affairs, Cromwell and his troops appeared, and severe was the retribution which they inflicted. The Irish proprietors were replaced by other men. Those who conquered the country remained to hold it, and the land was occupied by military colonies. It had appeared on the occasion of former settlements of English in Ireland that when the two races were intermixed on equal terms the English character was lost; and became merged in that of the people they had joined. Cromwell therefore determined that the families of the chiefs should be transplanted, as far as such a plan could be adopted, into the far west wilds of Connaught. The Shannon formed a natural boundary to this province, and thus a line would be drawn between the upper and middle class of natives and the colonists. The Irish peasants might remain under their new masters and learn their habits, manners, and religion. Those who had been engaged in the war were to choose Connaught or exile, and as the greater number preferred exile, they entered the French, Spanish, and Austrian services. The Romanist priests were declared guilty of high treason and ordered to depart, but many tried to remain. They were, however, dispersed. On these principles Ireland was laid out and resettled by Cromwell's officers. The soldiers were placed by regiments and troops almost on the very lands they had conquered. But outlaws lingered amongst them, and the colonists were shot at in the woods and fields, till, a price being set upon the heads of these assailants, they were disposed of by the settlers as enemies whom they regarded almost as wild animals.

Even harder measure was advised by some of Cromwell's officers. They said, "The order to the Israelites was to root out the heathen lest they should cause them to forsake the Lord their God." Such was the Cromwellian settlement in Ireland, which was unrelenting in its severity; the owners were deprived of the rights they had forfeited, and their religion was proscribed. The Irish parliament was swept away and the two countries were to be made one. It is possible, as our author¹ says, that if this mode of government had been persisted in for a sufficient time Ireland might have become more prosperous and peaceful than she had hitherto been; but it must be acknow-

¹ Froude.

ledged that those blessings, if achieved, would have been purchased by confiscation and the sword. Its result, however, remains a matter of uncertainty, for the restoration of royalty caused another change of affairs. Oliver Cromwell's son Henry was in command of Ireland when his father died, but his authority ceased with the retirement of his brother Richard. The Irish Romanist landowners had espoused the cause of Charles I., but the military settlers left in that country by Cromwell had been his bitterest enemies. The king was pledged to offer some protection to the landowners, but the new settlers could not all be expelled. Charles felt the difficulty of the case, and he and his counsellors did the best they could under the circumstances.

One of our most eloquent modern historians¹ thus describes the state of feeling in Ireland at this time: "In that island existed feuds compared with which the hottest animosities between contending parties in England were lukewarm." Cromwell's colonists asserted that the native inhabitants were deadly enemies of the English nation; they urged the king to follow up the policy of Cromwell, and were not ashamed to hint that there would never be peace in Ireland till the old Irish race should be extirpated. The Romanists dwelt on the severity with which they had been treated. A compromise was at length effected. About one-third of the forfeited territory was given back and the restoration of the Irish parliament and the re-establishment of the reformed Irish Church followed. But those who had been actively concerned in the massacre of 1641, and the regicides who had received grants of estates for their families, were allowed no favour.

The act of uniformity in its main points was passed in the parliament at Dublin in 1665, and during the same year an act was passed to prevent persons from holding bishoprics or benefices in both England and Ireland at the same time. But the number of nonconformists who were now in Ireland prevented the Church regaining its former footing. The presbyterians in Ulster retained their religious views. After a time the independents who were in the southern provinces began to emigrate to New England, and of those who remained their descendants gradually became Romanists and adopted the prejudices of the native Irish as well as their religion. During the reign of Charles II., however, Ireland remained tranquil.² The marquis (now duke) of Ormonde was made lord lieutenant.

It is the tendency of mankind to run into extremes. Under the rule of the puritans everything in the nature of gaiety and amusement was looked upon as sinful; the innocent sports around the Maypole and by the Christmas fire were sternly forbidden. The fine arts were almost banished from the land. Religion was made gloomy, and the frequent use of cant phrases, the peculiar names

¹ Macaulay.

² Froude's *English in Ireland*, vol. i., p. 130—154. *History of England*, by Macaulay, vol. i., p. 89. Collier, vol. viii., p. 469.

and phraseology adopted by the different sects, had thoroughly wearied the bulk of the nation. Released from these restrictions at the Restoration, the people rushed wildly into the opposite extreme. The king led a life of indolence and profligacy; the court was composed of dissolute men, and beautiful, witty, but worthless women. The example of the court was followed elsewhere; irreligion and licentiousness became widely spread. Charles's easy nature was not inclined to tyrannize over others; he rather sought to govern without trouble. If money was obtained to supply his extravagances, his honour and conscience were not disturbed by the means used to procure it.¹ After a short illness Charles died February, 1685, having secretly on his death-bed received the rites of the Roman Catholic church. He was succeeded by his brother James, duke of York. An epigram, said to be written by the earl of Rochester, one of the wits of the court, gives Charles the following character:—

“ Here lies our sovereign lord the king,
Whose word no man relies on,
Who never said a foolish thing,
Nor ever did a wise one.”

The divines belonging to the English Church during this century were remarkable for their learning and piety. We may mention Dr. Joseph Hall, bishop of Norwich, whose works fill several volumes. He was one of the five bishops who were sent to the Tower by the long Parliament. Doctor Christopher Sutton, who wrote his *Learn to Live* and *Learn to Die*, which have been valuable aids to devotion in many a household. Doctor Henry Hammond, a friend of Hyde and Falkland, was one of the most excellent of men. He was born in 1605, at Chertsey, in Surrey, and became rector of Penshurst in Kent in 1633. His deep learning was only equalled by his devotion to his parochial duties; in daily services, preaching, catechizing, visiting the sick, and relieving the poor, his energies never failed. He was the favourite chaplain of Charles I., and followed him in all his reverses, but was detained a prisoner at Oxford for some months when the parliamentary commissioners visited that university. During the remainder of those troubled times he found a retreat at Sir John Pakington's residence in Warwickshire; and dying there in 1660, just previous to the return of Charles II., was buried in the family vault of the Pakingtons at Hampton. The name of George Herbert is dear to churchmen. Descended from the old family of Montgomery, he was a good deal at the court of James I. during his earlier years, and when he decided to take holy orders, a friend dissuaded him from undertaking what he considered the obscure position of a country parson, to which Herbert replied, “I will labour to make it honourable by consecrating all my learning and all my poor abilities to advance the glory of that God that gave them;” and faithfully did he he carry out that resolution. In 1627 he accepted

¹ Bishop Short, p. 535.

the living of Bemerton, near Salisbury, where he displayed the character of a parish priest in its highest and purest form. Shortly after his arrival there he drew up certain rules for his conduct, which were afterwards printed in a small volume called *The Country Parson*, so admirable in its directions that no clergyman should be without it. As a sacred poet, he holds a high place. In his *Church Porch* are many exquisite sentiments.

“Think, when the bells do chime,
 ’Tis angels’ music; therefore come not late.

 In time of service seal up both thine eyes
 And send them to thy heart;

 Let vain or busy thoughts have there no part.
 Bring not thy plough, thy plots, thy pleasure thither.

 Judge not the preacher;

 The worse speak something good. If all want sense,
 God takes a text, and preacheth patience.”

Herbert loved music, and would often say, “Religion does not banish mirth, but only moderates and sets rules to it.” His charity was unbounded, and his wife was a true helpmate to him in this and all other matters. The Sunday before his death he played and sang one of his poems, of which we give a few lines—

“The Sundays of man’s life,
 Threaded together on time’s string,
 Make bracelets to adorn the wife
 Of the eternal, glorious king.”

So lived and died George Herbert, of whom it may be truly said that—

“The religious actions of the just
 Smell sweet in death, and blossom in the dust.”

Bishop Jeremy Taylor was a contemporary and a friend of Herbert, and one of the most eminent writers of the Anglican communion. He, like Herbert, was a chaplain to Charles I. During the downfall of royalty he found a home at Golden Grove in Carmarthenshire, then the seat of Richard Vaughan, earl of Carbery,¹ where he composed that well-known guide to devotion, *The Golden Grove*. His sermons on the marriage-ring and on the death of the countess of Carbery contain passages of much beauty; this lady seems to have inspired two of our greatest writers with respect and admiration, as Milton’s *Ladye* in the *Masque of Comus* was written for her to personate. Soon after the restoration Jeremy Taylor was appointed to the bishopric of Down and Connor, and in 1667 his

¹ Now the property of earl Cawdor.

remains were laid within the precincts of the cathedral of Dromore.¹

Leighton, Sanderson, Patrick, Beveridge, Pearson are some of the many learned divines with which the Church was blessed at this era. Doctor Pearson's name is inseparably connected with his work on the creed, which has always maintained a high celebrity and has been several times reprinted. Dr. Thomas Wilson flourished towards the close of this century, and as bishop of Sodor and Man for fifty-seven years, he adorned the episcopal office with an earnestness, a zeal, and simplicity which have been rarely surpassed. His *Short Instruction on the Lord's Supper* has long been in general use. The following letter addressed to his children was found amongst his papers after his death :—" My children,—If I do not live to tell you why I have saved no more for you out of my bishopric, let this satisfy you: that the less you have of goods gathered from the Church, the better the rest that I leave you will prosper. Church livings were never designed to make families, or to raise portions out of them, but to maintain our families, to keep up hospitality, to feed the poor, &c. And one day you will be glad that this was my settled opinion; and God grant I may act accordingly." Bishop Wilson was too much attached to his diocese ever to leave it, though he might thereby have obtained greater wealth and worldly honour; and when he died at the age of ninety-three, his coffin was made from one of the elm-trees which he had planted on his coming to the island, and which he had ordered to be prepared for that purpose.

This notice of eminent churchmen would be incomplete if the names of John Evelyn and Izaak Walton were omitted—laymen distinguished for true religion, combined with literary attainments. From the diary of the former we have already given some extracts. Born at Wotton in Surrey in 1620, Evelyn left England at the age of twenty-one, and after travelling in various countries resolved in 1651 to return to his native land. He took up his abode at Sayes-court near Deptford, having compounded with the soldiers who had possession of it. This property belonged to Sir Richard Browne, whose only daughter Evelyn had married, and he remarks that it was "suffering very much for the want of some friend to rescue it out of the power of the usurpers." He writes in November, 1655, "There was now nothing practical preached, or that pressed reformation of life, but high and speculative points that few understood, which left people very ignorant and of no steady principles, the source of all our sects and divisions, God of his mercy amend it!" Speaking of the great fire, he says, "I was

¹ We cannot resist inserting the following remarks by an Irishman of our own time :—"In the little church of Dromore, hard by the murmuring Logan, lie buried the bones of Jeremy Taylor—Usher was Irish—and Berkeley of Derry. When Irishmen consent to let the past become indeed history, not party politics, and begin to learn from it the lessons of mutual respect and tolerance, instead of bitterness and enmity, then, at last, this land shall see the dawn of hope and peace, and begin to renew her youth and rear her head amongst the proudest of nations." From *Life and Times of Hugh O'Neill, Earl of Tyrone*, preface, p. 9, by John Mitchell. Dublin: Duffy, 1845.

infinitely concerned to find that goodly church St. Paul's now a sad ruin, nothing remaining entire in the portico but the inscription showing by whom it was built."¹ On completing his sixtieth year Evelyn writes, "I began a more solemn survey of my whole life. . . . How difficult and yet how necessary a work! . . . The Lord be merciful to me, and . . . teach me so to number my days that I may apply my heart into wisdom." Evelyn died in 1705 at the age of eighty-six, and the inscription on his tomb records that, living in an age of extraordinary events, he learnt (as he himself asserted) that "all is vanity which is not honest, and that there is no solid wisdom but in true piety."

Izaak Walton's parents were honest yeomen in the county of Stafford, and he was apprenticed in early life to a relative who was a tradesman in London. Here he became intimate with the celebrated doctor Donne, dean of St. Paul's, who was one of the ornaments of the Church in the early part of this century, and to this intimacy we owe the interesting biography of that divine, which, together with those of Hooker, Herbert, Sanderson, and Sir Henry Wotton, all written by Walton, forms one of the most attractive volumes in our language. During the troubled times of the civil wars and commonwealth, it is supposed that Walton retired to the neighbourhood of his native town, employing his time in study, and in angling of which he was passionately fond. His delightful book on that subject, its reverent and thankful spirit, its unobtrusive learning and moral tone, have fascinated all its readers. His second wife was a sister to bishop Ken. A few years before his death he published two letters entitled *Love and Truth*, in which he says, "Almighty God hath appointed me to live in an age in which contention increases and charity decays. . . . I will endeavour to be humble, to fast and pray, to be charitable, to comfort distressed families, to love my neighbours, to pardon my enemies. . . . For I am sure these be sacrifices which please God Almighty and will bring peace at last, and so my faith in Christ's merits for my salvation will be more and more confirmed; . . . and be my comfort when I must make my last great account to the Searcher of all hearts."²

Amongst the giddy beauties of the court of Charles II.—amongst them, but not of them—was Margaret, daughter of colonel Blagge. Of her it has been said that neither the license of those evil days nor the scandal with which the court abounded ever touched her spirit or her reputation. Like a true daughter of the Church of England, she found in its ordinances and prayers such communion with her Saviour as enabled her to maintain a simple unaffected purity, though surrounded by evil companions in a licentious court. Her father, who had been a steadfast supporter of royalty during all its misfortunes, died shortly after the restoration of Charles II., but

¹ The cathedral was rebuilt by Sir Christopher Wren, and was finished in 1708; the building had occupied 37 years.

² See Walton's *Life of George Herbert*; also *Lives of Englishmen*.

his orphan children were not forgotten by that monarch, and Margaret's beauty and piety were remarkable in a court where those qualities were rarely united. She married Sydney Godolphin, afterwards lord high treasurer, and died at the birth of her first child. Her life was written by John Evelyn, whose fatherly regard is touchingly shown in the recital.¹

¹ See *Life of Mrs. Godolphin*, by Evelyn, first published and edited by Samuel Wilberforce, late bishop of Winchester.

CHAPTER XXXI.

CENTURY XVII.

JAMES II., A.D. 1685. TRIAL OF THE SEVEN BISHOPS. ABDICATION OF JAMES.

JAMES II. had declared on his accession that he was prepared to uphold the Church of England, but his devotion to the Romish communion was too extreme to admit of his keeping this promise. Mass was performed publicly in his palace; but not content with that he determined on having it celebrated at Westminster with all the pomp with which it had been surrounded in former times. Thus Englishmen again saw the Romish service performed in their midst. A papal nuncio was sent to England and publicly received at Windsor, none having been received since the death of Mary in 1558. Pope Innocent XI. was too wise to believe that a nation so high spirited and stubborn as the English could be brought back to the Church of Rome by a violent exercise of royal authority; he cautioned the king, and advised patience and moderation, to which prudent counsel James turned a deaf ear. He desired the admission of Romanists to offices from which the test act excluded them, and was bent on repealing both that and the act of habeas corpus passed in the previous reign. The cavalier country gentlemen, on the other hand, wished generally to support both acts. During the rebellion of the duke of Monmouth, James had violated the test act by placing Romanist officers in newly raised regiments. This proceeding was uncensured at the time, as he had been suddenly called on to defend his crown, but after the danger was over the officers were not removed, and it was announced that the king did not intend to be any longer tied by that act, and that he hoped to induce parliament to repeal it. The deep murmur which arose throughout the country should have warned James of the danger of awaking hostility on such a point, for the feelings of the English nation were especially disturbed at that time by the revocation of the edict of Nantes. It will be remembered that this measure had been granted by Henry IV. in 1598, as one of protection and toleration to the Huguenots. It was repealed by Louis XIV. in 1685, and a bitter persecution followed. It is calculated that in a few months fifty thousand families left France for ever, of whom many of the men became soldiers under William prince of Orange, who was the unrelenting enemy of Louis.¹ The more peaceable classes settled in Germany and England. In this country they erected silk manufactories at Spitalfields, a suburb in east London.

¹ Macaulay, vol. i., pp. 221, 324, 327.

These French events occurred just before parliament met, and did not incline its members to listen to any projects of toleration whereby more liberty would be given to the Roman catholics. They considered—and indeed the persecution in France convinced them—that the spirit of the Church of Rome was the same as it had been in the days of Gardiner and of Alva, and they did not doubt that James would follow the example of Louis XIV., should an opportunity occur. The king in his speech to parliament said he intended to keep the Roman catholic officers in his employ, as he could rely on their fidelity, thus intimating that he should not attend to the test act, though his endeavours to get rid of it through an act of parliament should fail. In the house of lords, Compton bishop of London, speaking the feelings of his brethren, said the whole constitution was in danger.

The king prorogued the parliament, and endeavoured to obtain from the judges an opinion favourable to his proceedings, but neither they nor his council would second his views. They were accordingly dismissed and others installed in their room. Romanists were placed in the privy council, and in 1686 the important post of dean of Christchurch, Oxford, was given to one of that communion. The court of high commission was in effect established under a different name. The bishop of London gave great offence to the king because he would not suspend one of his clergy¹ who had preached against some of the errors of popery.

During many years the zeal and affection of churchmen for hereditary monarchy and for the Church had grown up together; through good and evil they were true to Church and king. How great then would be their trial when these august and venerable powers hitherto so closely connected should be divided by a deadly enmity. How could they give to Cæsar the honour due to Cæsar, and yet withhold not from God that which was due to God? But though churchmen amidst all the provocations that surrounded them remained peaceable subjects, they saw with alarm and concern the progress of what they considered a dangerous and unscrupulous superstition; and whilst the clergy abjured all thoughts of defending their religion by the sword, they betook themselves manfully to weapons of a different kind. They regarded it as a point of duty to preach against the errors of popery, and the clergy of London, who in ability and influence were at the head of their profession, set an example in this respect, which was bravely followed by their brethren in the country. The errors and dangers of Romanism were denounced by thousands of divines from Berwick to Penzance. They were a numerous, intrepid, and well appointed band of combatants—scholars deeply versed in the writings of the fathers and in all parts of ecclesiastical history.²

It might be supposed that this would have made James pause, but such was not the case. In April, 1687, he issued a declaration

¹ Macaulay, vol. i., pp. 334, 357. Bishop Short, p. 556.

² Macaulay, vol. i., pp. 338, 361, 369.

for liberty of conscience by which penal laws and tests of every kind were suspended, and the oaths of supremacy and allegiance dispensed with. By these acts James hoped to conciliate the dissenters at the same time that he benefited the Romanists at the expense of the English Church, which he knew was the great bulwark against popery; but he gave great offence to all true patriots. During the early part of James's reign dissenters had suffered much persecution. Baxter, when in his 70th year, was cited before the infamous judge Jeffries, who, after treating him with great indignity, sentenced him to fines and imprisonment. Some of the dissenters now passed severe reflections on the clergy and their proceedings, but the more moderate ones did not concur in this, and a breach took place amongst them. A portion joined the court and Romanist party in hostility to the Church; but Baxter, whose violent feelings had been cooled down by old age and reflection, exerted all his influence to promote a better understanding between the presbyterians and the Church, and in this he was joined by Howe and Bunyan.¹

A masterly tract, addressed to dissenters, was published, in which those arguments most likely to convince them were used, proving that it was their duty to prefer an alliance with churchmen to one with Romanists and the court. It was written on a single sheet, and more than twenty thousand copies were circulated by the post. It had a great effect.²

The universities of Oxford and Cambridge were now attacked, and though a strong resistance was made, the king succeeded in placing a Roman catholic at the head of Magdalen college, Oxford. Many of the members left in consequence, protesting against the illegality of the proceedings.

In 1688 further Romanist proceedings irritated the people. James, when he had so offended the mass of his subjects that he dared not call a parliament, republished his declaration of liberty of conscience with a new preface and conclusion. By this the tests were abandoned, and Romanists were to be admitted to offices in Church and state. It was directed by an order in council on May 7th to be read in every parish church on the 20th of that month during divine service.³ There was little time for deliberation and none for consultation with the main body of the clergy, but those in London held a meeting and decided not to read it. Amongst those present were some well known names, Tillotson, dean of Canterbury; Sherlock, master of the Temple; Patrick, dean of Peterborough; and Stillingfleet, dean of St. Paul's. Meanwhile several of the bishops were anxiously deliberating at the primate's residence at Lambeth, as to the best course to pursue. The archbishop had written to desire as many of his brethren to attend for that purpose as could do so, and to request the opinion of those who, through age or infirmity, were unable to undertake the jour-

¹ Macaulay, vol. i., p. 233. Bishop Burnet's *History of his own Times*, vol. ii., p. 42.

² Macaulay, vol. ii., p. 28.

³ Ibid., vol. i., p. 328. Bishop Short, p. 564—566.

ney. On the 18th of May a meeting of bishops and other eminent divines took place at Lambeth. After solemn prayer and earnest consultation a petition was drawn up to be presented to the king. In this memorable document all disloyalty and intolerance was disclaimed, and his majesty was assured that the Church was, now as ever, faithful to the throne. The petition showed neither want of respect to the king's authority nor want of tenderness for the dissenters; but it avowed that as parliament had decided that the crown had no power to dispense with statutes in matters ecclesiastical, the royal declaration was unlawful. The dispensing power had been pronounced illegal by several parliaments, and was a matter of such vital importance both in Church and state that the petitioners could not in prudence, honour, or conscience be parties to the solemn publishing of the declaration in God's house and during divine service.

The petition was signed by Sancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, and six bishops, namely, Lloyd, bishop of St. Asaph; Turner, bishop of Ely; Lake, bishop of Chichester; Ken, bishop of Bath and Wells; White, bishop of Peterborough; and Sir John Trelawny, bishop of Bristol; and the following day it was presented by them to the king, who, on reading it, exclaimed that it was a standard of rebellion, and insisted that the declaration should be published. Bishop Ken replied, "We have two duties to perform, our duty to God and our duty to your majesty. We honour you, but we fear God." James in much anger told them he would keep the paper and remember those who had signed it.¹

Sunday the 20th of May arrived; the king had made no concession; but the clergy were steadfast, and in only four out of the hundred parish churches in the city and liberties of London was the declaration read. Even in the chapel of St. James's palace the clergyman had the courage to disobey the king's demand. Never had the Church been so dear to the people as on that occasion.

A week of agitation and anxiety passed. On Sunday the churches were thronged, but the declaration was still unread, and in those few places where the king's command was obeyed the agitation of the reader was evident, and many of the congregation left the Church. The king was alarmed for a moment at the tempest he had raised. Baxter praised the conduct of the bishops and parochial clergy, and the nonconformists generally declared that they would not separate their cause from that of the Church. Some of the Romanist peers cautioned the king against going to extremes, but the violent advice of father Peter and the Jesuit party was, unhappily, too well suited to James's own temper and prevailed over wiser counsels.

The prelates were summoned before the king in council: they appeared, but were resolute in their decision. A warrant was made out committing them to the Tower, and a barge was manned to convey them down the river.

¹ Macaulay's *History of England*, vol. ii., p. 92. Burnet, vol. ii., p. 455.

It was known all over London that the bishops were before the council, and the public anxiety was intense. The courts of Whitehall and the neighbouring streets were crowded. The river was alive with boats; and when the seven came forth under a guard, the emotions of the people broke through all restraint. Thousands fell on their knees and prayed aloud for their safety, and many dashed into the stream and cried to the holy fathers to bless them. All down the river the barge passed between two lines of boats from which arose a shout of "God bless your lordships." The king, greatly alarmed, ordered the garrison at the Tower to be doubled, but the very sentinels asked for a blessing from their prisoners. The coaches of the first nobles of the land were seen each day round the prison gates, while thousands of humble rank covered Tower Hill. A deputation of the nonconformist ministers visited the Tower, which still more alarmed and enraged the king. He sent for four of their number and reproached them; when they courageously replied, that they thought it their duty to forget past quarrels and stand by those who stood by the reformed faith.

The lieutenant of the Tower, himself a Romanist, was little inclined to treat his prisoners with kindness. The bishops impressed all who saw them by the firmness and cheerfulness with which they endured their confinement, by the modesty and meekness with which they received the applause and blessing of the nation, and by the loyal attachment which they professed for their sovereign. At the end of a week they were brought before the court of king's bench, and as they passed through a line of spectators, who blessed and applauded them, "Friends," said the prisoners, "honour the king, and remember us in your prayers." The trial was fixed for that day fortnight, and the crown lawyers were wise in not requiring sureties, as twenty-one peers were ready to offer bail, while one of the richest dissenters in the city had begged to have the honour of giving security for bishop Ken.

Before the day of trial the agitation had spread to the furthest corners of the island. The people of Cornwall were greatly moved by the danger of Sir John Trelawny, bishop of Bristol, who belonged to an ancient Cornish family and was very popular in his native county.

The 29th of June arrived, that eventful day on which the fate of the seven brave confessors of the Church of England was to be decided. The streets were thronged with people. The court of king's bench was filled with such an auditory as had never before and has never since been assembled within its walls. The trial commenced—a trial which even after the lapse of time has all the interest of a drama. The advocates on each side contended with vehemence, and the audience listened as if the fate of every one of them was to be decided by the verdict. The foreman of the jury was Sir Robert Langley, a baronet of old family. It has been said by a recent writer¹ that in this great trial, "the judges were

¹ Green's *History of the English People*, 1877, p. 656.

mere tools of the crown;" but this is unjust. Sir Richard Holloway and Sir John Powell acted a noble and independent part, which was so highly resented by the king that they were displaced.¹ At that time their removal was in the power of the crown, as the judges held their seats only during pleasure. Macaulay says Sir John Powell's "character for honesty stood high." In summing up Sir John stated that in his judgment the declaration was a nullity, and the dispensing power claimed by the crown was inconsistent with the law. If these encroachments of prerogative were allowed, there was an end of parliaments. The whole authority would be in the king. This eminent judge, of whom Welshmen may be proud, was a native of Llanwrda, Carmarthenshire, and had been a pupil of bishop Jeremy Taylor, who it will be remembered found a home at Golden Grove, in that county, during the civil war and commonwealth. Powell was restored to his office after the abdication of James. He possessed property in the neighbourhood and town of Laugharne, where he had a handsome house, and exercised great hospitality. He died in 1696. There is a monument to his memory in Laugharne church.² It was dark when the jury retired to consider their verdict, and it was ten the following morning when the court again met. There was a breathless stillness, and when the foreman of the jury pronounced the words, "Not guilty," benches and galleries raised a shout. The thousands who were crowded in Westminster hall replied with a still louder shout, which was followed by that of the crowd without. The boats on the Thames gave an answering cheer, and so the glad tidings flew from street to square, from market-place to coffee-room, from the Savoy to London bridge, while horsemen were dispatched to carry the news of the acquittal to the country districts.

The bishops took refuge in the nearest church from the overwhelming crowd which asked their blessing. Many of the churches were open, to which persons repaired to offer up their thanks to God. The jury could scarcely make their way out of the hall. "God bless you," cried the people, "and prosper your families—you have saved us all to day." The king had that morning visited the camp on Hounslow heath, and was greatly disturbed when the express reached him with the news. Respect for royalty prevented the soldiers giving way to their feelings till James had quitted the camp. Their shouts then surprised him, and he asked what the uproar meant. "Nothing," was the reply, "but the soldiers are glad the bishops are acquitted." "Do you call that nothing?" said the king; "but so much the worse for them."

In the evening bonfires blazed and windows were lighted up—nor was the enthusiasm confined to London and other great towns; the rejoicing was universal.

"The prosecution of the bishops," says Macaulay, whose eloquent description of the trial we have quoted, "is an event which stands by

¹ See Hume, ch. lxx.

² *Antiquities of Laugharne, Carmarthenshire*, by Mary Curtis.

itself in our history." It called forth two feelings of tremendous power—love of the Church, and love of freedom. The spectacle of more than nine thousand clergymen, with the primate and his suffragans at their head, willing to endure bonds and the spoiling of their goods, rather than comply with that which they knew to be contrary to the principles of our free constitution, won the admiration and love of all classes of the nation. Our ancestors were united in one great mass against the misgovernment of James. The nobility, the landed gentry, the clergy, both the universities, the inns of court, merchants, farmers, peasants, all made common cause. Presbyterians, independents, baptists, forgot their feuds and united in the rejoicings occasioned by the acquittal of the bishops.¹

The Cornish men had risen and marched as far as Exeter on their way to London to insist on the liberation of bishop Trelawny, when the news reached them of his acquittal. The following verses are part of a popular ballad since composed,² but the chorus was sung in Cornwall at that time:—

"A good sword and a trusty hand,
A merry heart and true,
King James's men shall understand
What Cornish lads can do.
And have they fixed the where and when?
And shall Trelawny die?
Then twenty thousand Cornish men
Will know the reason why.

CHORUS.

What, will they scorn Tre, Pol, and Pen?³
And shall Trelawny die?
Then twenty thousand Cornish men
Will know the reason why.

Out-pake the Captain brave and bold,
A gallant knight was he;
Though London's Tower were Michael's hold,
We'll set Trelawny free.
Trelawny, he's in keep and hold,
Trelawny, he may die;
But here's twenty thousand Cornish bold
Will know the reason why.'

CHORUS.

What, will they scorn Tre, Pol, and Pen?
And shall Trelawny die?
Then twenty thousand Cornish men
Will know the reason why."

The princess Mary, who had married William prince of Orange, was heiress to the throne; she was the king's eldest daughter, by

¹ See Macaulay, vol. ii., p. 92—112.

² By Rev. R. S. Hawker, vicar of Morwenstow.

³ "By Tre, Pol, and Pen, you may know Cornish men," says a Cornish song.

his first marriage with the daughter of lord chancellor Clarendon, but all hope of her succession was now removed by the birth of a prince, which event took place on the day the bishops were committed to the Tower. The announcement was unwelcome to the country, for it seemed to render its escape from popish rulers hopeless, as the infant prince would be in the hands of Jesuits from his cradle. There was also a wide spread belief that the heir thus presented to the nation was not really the offspring of royalty, and that the whole affair was a plot of the Jesuits. King James has long since been fully acquitted of the fraud which his people imputed to him; but so general was the belief at the time, and so convenient was it in later years to encourage the impression, that the unfortunate prince was always known in England as the "pretender."

In the mean time some of the nobility and gentry, weary of James's attacks upon their Church and liberties, were in secret correspondence with William prince of Orange. When James found his crown was in danger, he turned for counsel to the bishops, some of whom he had so illegally treated, and was by them advised to redeem the promises he had made of guarding the liberties of the national Church. But it was too late, even had he possessed the inclination to retrace his steps. The prince of Orange responded to the invitation given, and landed at Torbay with sixteen thousand troops. The abdication and flight of the king soon followed; William was entrusted with the management of affairs, and was formally requested by the peers to summon a parliament. The bishops as a body declined to sanction this movement, which they considered contrary to their oath of allegiance to king James, and when parliament met in February, 1689, twelve of their number voted for the appointment of the prince of Orange as regent, and only two voted with the majority, which decided to offer the crown to William and Mary.

The doctrine of non-resistance or passive obedience as it has been called, was carried to a great extent by the English Church at that time, and it was asserted that no breach of law on the part of a lawful king could justify his people in withstanding him by force. Some have expressed surprise that the high-spirited cavaliers of England should have been zealous for a theory which was so subversive of liberty. But to the cavalier this theory represented freedom. To him rebellion was associated with wrongs and insults and degradation, and the restored authority of the monarch had given back to him liberty. He had never imagined that a time might come when a king—a Stuart—would persecute the most loyal of the clergy and gentry. That time, however, had now arrived, and resistance to such a prince as James they felt could not be called rebellion. They could not fight for James II. as they had done for Charles I.¹ But to several of the prelates and clergy their allegiance to their lawful sovereign raised an insuperable barrier to any recognition of another, and we shall presently see that their

¹ See Macaulay, vol. ii., ch. ix.

refusal to take a new oath of allegiance was unfortunate in its results to the Church.

At the death of Charles II. the established episcopal Church in Scotland was in a more prosperous and peaceable state than it had been since the restoration. The Romanists were few. Some of the old nobility and gentry in the highlands and isles still belonged to that communion, but in the lowlands its influence was at an end. The penal laws had done much, and the civil disabilities and constant annoyances to which they were exposed did more towards their extermination than direct persecution had done; this was the case afterwards with the adherents of the reformed episcopacy.¹ The presbyterians were at that time divided into two sects who hated each other. These were the indulged, and the Cameronians, or covenanting faction. The former had for the most part conformed to the Church and attended its ministrations. The Cameronians kept resolutely apart. The well informed presbyterians acknowledged that they could conscientiously live in communion with the episcopal Church, to which many of them were willingly reconciled, and in several of the northern counties there were few or no dissenters. Soon after the accession of James II. that sovereign wished to do away with the test acts and penal statutes in Scotland, and used all his influence to induce the members of the Scottish parliament to concur in his views, but they, like their English brethren, saw that this leniency meant nothing else but to obtain a footing for the Romanists. The conduct of the English parliament confirmed them in their opposition. The Scottish bishops also resolutely opposed the views of James, which gave him great offence.

Early in 1687 the king, unable to overcome the distaste of the Scottish parliament to his measures, resolved to act on his sole authority, and issued a proclamation dispensing with all tests and penal statutes. A portion of the presbyterians expressed their gratitude to James for this act in a letter which is still extant. The covenanting Cameronians in the west refused to accept the toleration, asserting with truth that its sole design was to introduce popery. His majesty was satisfied with publishing his declaration, and did not command the bishops and clergy of Scotland to read it to their flocks. In that country as in England the conduct of the king had estranged from him the affection of his subjects, and when the prince of Orange arrived, he encountered little opposition from the northern kingdom.² It was, however, at first thought that he intended only to interpose his mediation in order to restore the laws and liberties of the nation, but with his accession to the throne other incidents arose which terminated, as we shall presently relate, in the overthrow of the episcopal establishment in Scotland.

¹ Grub, vol. ii., p. 343.

² *The Episcopal Church of Scotland from the Reformation to the Revolution*, by J. P. Lawson, M.A., vol. i., p. 872. Russell, vol. ii., p. 310.

The history of the religious movement in that country from the days of John Knox to the close of the reign of James II. is little else than a history of insurrection and persecution. Intolerance and bigotry did not pass away with the generation who listened to Knox. In the reign of Charles I. and during the commonwealth, the spirit of persecution glowed to such an extent amongst the leading presbyterians that they refused toleration to every other class of Christians. Their most celebrated divines, such as Calamy and Burgess, represented it as the floodgate to all manner of iniquity. Another of their writers speaks of toleration as "the grand design of the devil . . . the destroyer of all religion—the liberty of perdition . . . all the devils in hell and their instruments being at work to promote toleration."¹ These opinions were generally held by the presbyterian and nonconformist party at that period. In one of the declarations put forth by them they say, "Toleration! it is like putting a cup of poison into the hands of children—proclaiming liberty to wolves to come into Christ's fold to prey upon the lambs; a toleration of soul murder." It is unnecessary to do more than refer to the solemn league and covenant, which set forth the duty of all who signed it to extirpate popery and prelacy by civil or military force, without respect of persons. Even at the restoration the fathers of the kirk were averse to a free exercise of conscience, and on no occasion did they approach the other party with a view of accommodation; though the episcopalians relinquished many of their observances as put forth in the articles of Perth, and yielded to presbyterian prejudices in the matter of robes and vestments, and even in their mode of worship.

In regard to the actual sufferings inflicted upon the covenanters, every one must deplore the unchristian spirit of the Scottish parliament, and the cruel statutes which it issued for the suppression of conventicles. The heart sickens at the details of massacres in the fields and torture in courts of justice, and the horror is increased by the reflection that all this was done in the name of religion. It must, however, be remembered that the troubles which disturbed Scotland from the accession of James I. to the abdication of James II. were not caused by religious motives only, for though a particular form of church government was put forward as the cause of dispute, it was a pretext wherewith the leaders covered most important political objects. Religious nonconformity in Scotland was therefore looked on by the government as a proof or mark of disaffection, and the covenanter was punished as a rebellious subject. Still the burden of reproach has been thrown upon episcopacy, and the cruelties were attributed by the people to the prelates, while they were really perpetrated under the rule of a presbyterian viceroy—a man who loved neither the Church nor its rulers.² In short, religion and politics are so mixed up during this

¹ Edwards's *Gangrena*, quoted by Russell, vol. ii., p. 316,

² See Russell, vol. ii., p. 319—331,

period of Scottish history, that severity in the one case necessarily involved severity in the other.

When the oath of allegiance to William and Mary was required to be taken in England, Sancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, with five of those prelates who had been imprisoned with him in the Tower, and three others, felt scruples on the subject on account of their previous oath of allegiance to James II. from which they did not consider themselves absolved. About four hundred of the clergy followed their example, some of whom held positions of importance in the Church. In consequence of their refusal they were suspended for six months, and afterwards ejected from their sees and benefices. The policy which obliged every one holding preferments to take the oath is questionable. It would probably have equally answered the purposes of the government, had such persons been required to make a promise not to disturb the new order of things.¹ Those who declined to take the oath became known by the name of "nonjurors," and the Church was thus deprived of some of the wisest and holiest of her priests, including Hickes, dean of Worcester; Kettlewell, vicar of Coleshill, in Warwickshire (of whom bishop Ken said, "He was certainly as saint-like a man as ever I knew"); and the learned church historian, Jeremy Collier. No one can fail to admire their conscientious fulfilment of what they considered their duty; and when it is remembered that these "nonjurors" belonged to that faithful band of clergy who had withstood the attempt of James II. to favour Romanism by his illegal exercise of a dispensing power, regret for their loss is added to our respect for their steadfast adherence to that which they thought right.

Many noted and excellent nonconformist divines flourished at this period. Foremost amongst them stands Richard Baxter, who had been an ordained minister of the English Church, but changing his religious opinions he joined the presbyterians. He was one of those who went to the Hague with the commissioners to invite Charles II. to England. At the Savoy conference he bore a conspicuous part. He was a man of great piety, much self-denial, and unwearied zeal; perhaps no one in England was so instrumental as he in bringing persons to a deep sense of religion, whether by his preaching or his writings. His moderation in his later years and his greater readiness to make allowance for the opinions of other men is very pleasing.² Baxter died in 1691.

The name of John Bunyan must ever be held in esteem as the author of the *Pilgrim's Progress*. Of humble origin—for he had been bred a tinker and had served as a private soldier in Cromwell's army—he knew no language but his own, and had studied no books with one important exception—our noble English Bible. Yet his genius supplied the want of learning. Early in life he was tortured by remorse of conscience for his youthful sins, till at length he

¹ Bishop Short, p. 580.

² See bishop Short, p. 500, and Berens, p. 153.

found comfort and relief in religion, and he then desired to impart to others the blessing of salvation. He joined the baptists and became a preacher and a writer. That wonderful allegory which has immortalized his name was at first the delight only of pious cottagers and mechanics; but when the attention of more learned critics was directed to it, they acknowledged that it was a masterpiece, and it has since taken a permanent place amongst standard religious works.¹ Bunyan was a native of the county of Bedford, and was imprisoned under the conventicle act after the restoration for many years, and at length released on the application of Barlow, bishop of Lincoln. He then resumed his occupation of a preacher at Bedford, and died in London in 1688.

¹ Macaulay, vol. ii., p. 32.

CHAPTER XXXII.

CENTURY XVII. AND XVIII.

WILLIAM AND MARY, A.D. 1688. INTOLERANCE OF PRESBYTERIANS IN SCOTLAND. CHURCH SOCIETIES. DEATH OF QUEEN ANNE, A.D. 1714.

WILLIAM III. had been bred a presbyterian and a Calvinist, and his religious views were latitudinarian. Two great parties may be said to have existed in the Church of England ever since the Reformation, but it was not till after the accession of William that they were known by the names of high and low Church. By this time there had grown up within the Church a new school of opinions which was gradually gaining much influence, increased by the fact that its views coincided to a certain extent with those of the new sovereign, and which may be considered very similar to that class in the Anglican communion which is now called broad Church. They professed indifference to what they considered the small matters in dispute between churchmen and dissenters (as the non-conformists now called themselves), and proposed to look at theology from a philosophical point of view. They received the name of latitudinarians from the laxity of their religious views, and their want of earnestness became a source of weakness to the Church.

William held most liberal opinions in regard to toleration, and acted on this principle towards protestant dissenters; but the high church party found no favour in his eyes, it being in fact politically as well as theologically obnoxious to him. The see of Salisbury was vacant on his arrival in this country, and a few days after he became king, he selected for that bishopric Gilbert Burnet. This appointment was highly unpopular with the clergy, and William, by the selection of a latitudinarian for his first bishop, displayed his own religious bias in a manner which was very unwelcome to the English Church. Burnet was of Scotch birth, and a Scotch episcopalian, but his relatives were presbyterians; he had long been settled in Holland, where he had been William's chaplain, and was very active in the negotiations and transactions which led to William's possession of the English throne.

When parliament met, two acts were brought in, namely, that for toleration, and what was called the comprehension scheme. By the bill for toleration the acts passed in the reign of Charles II., which had pressed hardly on the dissenters, though not repealed, were much relaxed, but Romanists were excluded from the benefit of this. The quakers, having an objection to take any oath, were permitted to sign certain declarations expressing fidelity to the government. Both bills were drawn up and laid before the house of peers by the earl of Nottingham, a churchman who was respected for the orthodoxy of his creed and the purity of his morals, and who possessed the confidence of the clergy. They had been prepared during the

reign of Charles II. The toleration act passed both houses with little debate. Nottingham would not move for the withdrawal of the test act, but was willing to propose some alterations in the liturgy, conceiving that if the entrance to the Church were a little widened, members who had hitherto lingered near the threshold would press in; but the comprehension bill, which was proposed with this view, met with no favour and was suffered to drop. One of the last acts of the non-juring bishops in their places in the house of peers was to join in moving these bills, thus supporting the protestant dissenters who had joined them in withstanding king James's declaration.¹ But the bill, had it passed, would have failed in its object, for the independents, baptists, and quakers were not to be gained over. The subject of the oaths of allegiance was then discussed, and it was finally decided that all who held ecclesiastical or academical offices should be required to take this oath on pain of deprivation.

The convocation of the Church according to ancient usage had always been summoned with a parliament, but in consequence of the irregular manner in which the houses of parliament had been brought together when the throne was vacant, no convocation had at this time been called. The commons suggested that it should be now summoned, and William acted on this advice; but before it met, a commission of thirty bishops and clergy was appointed to draw up a scheme of concessions which might conciliate the dissenters. The most active member of this committee was Tillotson, dean of Canterbury, under whose guidance a revision of the Book of Common Prayer was prepared with a view to the comprehension of dissenters into the Church, and Tillotson would even have admitted presbyterian ministers, and dispensed with assent and consent to the Book of Common Prayer. So many bishops were either absent from being non-jurors or were newly consecrated to their office, that the upper house of convocation was felt to be wanting in authority and weight. The lower house declined to have anything to do with the comprehension scheme. Convocation was dissolved, and Tillotson's influence hindered this synod of the Church from being re-assembled for some time. The Prayer Book, however, remained untouched.² In a short time Burnet and Tillotson had reason to consider that their defeat was really an escape from greater difficulties. Had the alterations proposed been carried out, the laity would probably have followed their non-juring divines, to whom they were strongly attached. If they had seen clergymen without surplices carrying the bread and wine up and down the Church to seated communicants, and had heard the compositions of the commissioners taking the place of the time-honoured collects, they would have betaken themselves to some non-juring assembly where the services they loved so well were performed without mutilation.³

¹ See Macaulay, vol. ii., ch. xi. ² Blunt's *Key to Church History*, p. 106.

³ Macaulay, vol. iii., p. 120.

In 1690, James Graham of Claverhouse, viscount Dundee, raised the northern clans in support of James II. The highlanders gathered round a leader in whom they had perfect confidence. In July Dundee met William's troops at Killiecrankie, where they were defeated; but Dundee was slain, and with his fall the cause of James became hopeless.¹

In the same year it became necessary to consider the question of filling up the sees of the non-juring bishops. Three had died, and two others eventually resigned their sees, one of whom was bishop Ken. Sancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, soured by the trials he had gone through, seems to have given way to a feeling of resentment. He and three other bishops thought themselves justified in consecrating successors, but this non-juring schism died out at the end of the next century. Tillotson was appointed to succeed Sancroft as archbishop of Canterbury, and in less than two years fifteen new bishops were appointed, most of whom belonged to the school of Tillotson and Burnet.

"Bishop Ken," says Macaulay, "both in intellectual and in moral qualities, ranked highest among the non-juring prelates."² He was born at Little Berkhamstead, in Hertfordshire, in 1637, and educated at Winchester, where his name, "Thomas Ken, 1656," cut in a corner of one of the stone buttresses, still remains. Charles II., when he on one occasion visited that city with his court, desired the use of Ken's house for his mistress, Nell Gwyn. "Not for his kingdom," was the spirited reply. This honest boldness so impressed the king that when the see of Bath and Wells became vacant shortly afterwards, Charles put aside all other considerations and determined to give it to Ken, saying, "Odd's fish! who shall have Bath and Wells, but the little fellow who would not give poor Nelly a lodging?" Ken took great interest in the education of the poor and highly valued the practice of catechizing. When he retired from his episcopal residence at Wells, he said he had done with strife, and should henceforth vent his feelings not in disputes but hymns. His charities had been so large that he had little left of his private fortune. But Thomas Thynne, lord Weymouth, did himself honour by offering the bishop a tranquil and dignified asylum at his mansion of Longleat. Lord Weymouth's early studies had been directed by doctor Hammond, who found a home under the roof of Sir John Pakington. Lady Pakington and Weymouth's mother were sisters, and it is interesting to trace the connection between these loyal houses whose annals are mingled with the names of these great and good divines. There he passed a happy and honoured old age, during which he never regretted the sacrifice which he had made to what he thought his duty, while he became more and more indulgent to those whose views of duty differed from his own. He died in 1710, having written many devotional works, besides the well known morning and evening hymns, but it has been well said that the "sweet savour of his

¹ Grub, vol. iii., p. 304.

² Macaulay, vol. iii., p. 100.

name" has perpetuated his memory with a still more excellent renown.¹ His lines on the parish priest are very beautiful, and recall to our minds the characters of Hammond and Herbert:—

"Give me the priest these graces shall possess,
Of an ambassador the just address;
A father's tenderness, a shepherd's care.
A leader's courage, which the cross can bear;
A ruler's awe, a watchman's wakeful eye,
A pilot's skill the helm in storms to ply;
A fisher's patience, and a labourer's toil,
A guide's dexterity to disembroil,
A prophet's inspiration from above,
A teacher's knowledge, and a Saviour's love."

The bill of rights, by which the power of the crown and the liberty of the subject were securely settled, was passed in 1689. A clause was inserted which excluded Romanists or such as married Romanists from succeeding to the throne, and absolved their subjects from their allegiance. This bill settled the succession to the throne on Mary, William, and the princess Anne; and it not only declared that the kingdom should not be governed by a papist, but enacted as a test that every English sovereign should subscribe the declaration against transubstantiation. The dispensing power of the crown, which had caused so many disputes, was fully considered and absolutely and for ever taken away. The act of settlement, which was a sequel to the bill of rights, provided that the princess Sophia, electress of Hanover, daughter of Elizabeth, queen of Bohemia, should be considered next heir to the throne after the princess Anne. The names of whig and tory, first given in ridicule, were now adopted as distinguishing the two political parties in the state.

In April, 1689, William and Mary were crowned joint sovereigns. William reigned through his marriage with the daughter of James II., but neither his temper nor his character fitted him for a subordinate part; and though nominally reigning jointly, William to all intents and purposes governed alone. He did not possess the art of gaining the affections of the English people, and was a foreigner in tastes and habits; his knowledge of the English language was deficient, his manners were cold, and his tone was imperious even to the wife to whom he owed so much. The queen did her best to supply the deficiencies of her lord, and employed all her influence to gain for him the hearts of the people.²

In Scotland religious animosity continued as usual to exist. As soon as William's landing in England was known, the covenanting Cameronians of the south-western counties formed themselves into armed bands, and succeeded in driving away from their livings two hundred clergymen, who, with their families, were exposed to all the pains and privations which cold, hunger, and a fanatical multitude could inflict. Their furniture was turned out of doors, their wives and children were reduced to the necessity of begging food

¹ Macaulay, vol. iii., p. 251. Also *Lives of Englishmen*, and *Life of bishop Ken*, by a Layman. ² Macaulay, vol. ii., p. 265.

and a roof to shelter them at that inclement season, and the ministers were themselves reviled, insulted, and sometimes beaten; their lives were threatened, their service books burned, and their clerical vestments torn to shreds. There were many among these clergy who were of the most unexceptionable character, and several were distinguished for their virtues and their attainments. This "rabbling," to use the phrase then in use, took place on Christmas day, for the ancient holy days of the Church were odious to the rigid covenanters. The tumults existed in the five associated counties where the Cameronians had most power, and where for some time they were able to exercise it without restraint. For several months after William's arrival the government of Scotland was in abeyance. Some connived at these outrages on the episcopal clergy in the west; but in Edinburgh the college of justice, including lawyers of all degrees, formed itself into a regiment to protect the Church and check the progress of the Cameronians. The sorrows and sufferings of the ejected clergymen at the time of the Revolution have not been chronicled in the same manner as the persecution of the covenanters during the latter part of the reigns of Charles II. and James II. Poets and orators have found the ravages of a lawless mob plundering houses and driving out their inhabitants, a less interesting and picturesque study than the warlike peasant leaning on his gun, listening to his favourite preacher in remote glens or on wild hill sides.¹

These outrages were highly offensive to William; all parties were commanded to lay down their arms, and it was directed that all ministers ejected by the insurgents should be replaced and not molested. The friends of order as usual obeyed and disbanded their corps, but the covenanters or Cameronians disregarded the commands of government, and on the first Sunday after the royal order was made known, they proceeded to Glasgow in order to attack the worshippers in the cathedral at that place. They surrounded the church, fired into the building, and at length violently broke open the doors, which had been shut upon their approach, and forcing an entrance beat and wounded many without sparing sex, age, or quality. An account of this atrocious outrage was sent to London, whither the Scottish bishops had dispatched the dean of Glasgow to plead the cause of their persecuted Church; but William did not yet possess the means of maintaining order in Scotland. A convention was called, and it met in Edinburgh in March, 1689. William had found it necessary to determine how the members should be chosen, and assumed the power of annulling some former statutes. The result was a majority of whigs and presbyterians. The episcopalians felt that it was no good sign that the covenanters from the west, having done all that was to be done in "rabbling" the clergy of their counties, now came dropping into Edinburgh by small numbers for the purpose of protecting or if needful of over-awing the convention. Between six and seven

¹ See Russell, vol. ii., p. 336—352. Macaulay, vol. iii., p. 2.

hundred of these men were brought into Edinburgh, and hid in garrets and cellars. It was evident that they were directed by some leader of great weight. The presbyterians carried all before them in the convention. After declaring that king James had forfeited his crown they announced "that prelacy and the superiority of any office in the Church above presbyters is and hath been a great and insupportable grievance to this nation."

All ministers were desired to pray for William and Mary as king and queen of the realm. This order, dated April 13th, was to be obeyed by the clergy in Edinburgh on the following day, and by those in other parts of the country on the 21st and 28th respectively. Considering the shortness of the time required for their decision and that the Scottish crown had not yet been actually offered to William and Mary, and was not, in fact, accepted by them for nearly a month afterwards, it is not surprising that many hesitated or refused to comply till time for consideration was given, especially as the Scottish oath of allegiance was even stronger than that of England; for they had not only sworn loyalty to king James but to his heirs. A court of inquiry was soon appointed, and witnesses were examined to prove that the ministers had omitted the required prayer, but no attention was paid to their defence, and about two hundred ministers were at once deprived. As to those who had been "rabbled" by the Cameronians in the western counties, the convention did not attempt to reinstate them in their livings.

After William and Mary had accepted the Scottish throne, the convention received the authority of a regular parliament, and prelacy was abolished by an act which was sent up to London for William's concurrence. In deciding between the rival claims of episcopacy and presbyterianism north of the Tweed, the form of church government to be adopted was in William's mind a mere question of expediency. The king told the episcopalians that he wished to preserve if possible the form to which they were so much attached, and at the same time to grant entire liberty of conscience to those who would be reconciled only to presbyterianism; but he could be no party to employing force of arms, though he would do his best to secure for episcopalians permission to worship God in freedom and safety.

The desire of the whig leaders to get rid of episcopacy caused them to make it an article of the contract by which the new sovereigns were to hold the Scottish crown; and in 1690 the presbyterian form of church government was established by vote of the Scottish parliament and the assent of the king.¹

William, who thought the episcopalians had been hardly used, apprehended they might meet with worse treatment when the new system was fully arranged, and when the act establishing presbyterianism was passed, he wished that it should be accompanied by another, allowing all who did not belong to that persuasion to hold their religious assemblies freely; but some of the presbyterian

¹ See Macaulay, vol. iii., ch. xiii., p. 1—22. Russell, vol. ii., p. 352—368.

ministers harangued so vehemently against liberty of conscience, that lord Melville, to whom William had entrusted the task, did not venture to obey his master's instructions. In October, 1690, the general assembly met. In this assembly there were no representatives from the more northern parts of Scotland, neither had any of the universities or colleges any representatives save that of Edinburgh; so that it was not *really* a general assembly of the Church of Scotland. A letter was read from the king in which he told them he "would have them to be very moderate in their proceedings, and not do any thing that might displease their neighbour Church." In their reply they claimed, and intended to confirm their claim by an act which declared "the presbyterian government to be of divine right and the true legal government of this Church;" but this act did not receive the royal approbation and dropped into oblivion. The king also wrote, "We expect that your management will be such that we may have no reason to repent of what we have done; we never could be convinced that violence was suited to the advancing of true religion; moderation is what religion enjoins, what neighbouring churches expect of you, and what we recommend to you."¹

In the northern counties of Scotland the majority of the people and nearly all the nobility and gentry preferred episcopacy, and it was known to be William's wish that such of the clergy as should take the oaths to his government and pray for him and the queen, as directed by law, should retain their parishes during their natural lives without being in subjection to presbyteries. An act, however, had been passed which had for its object the removal of episcopal incumbents and the placing of presbyterians in their room. This act allowed the presbyterian ministers and elders to purge out "insufficient, scandalous, and erroneous ministers;" and all who refused to appear when summoned, or on appearing should be found guilty of these charges by their accusers, were suspended or deprived of their churches, income, and benefices. This gave tremendous power to men who were generally the most violent of their party, and their proceedings were disapproved by the king.

As to those ministers who in the winter of 1688 had been driven from their parishes by the mob, they were described as certain ministers who had either deserted, or had been removed from preaching in their churches, and their cures were declared vacant, and open to the possession of presbyterian preachers. The duke of Hamilton observed with regard to this statement, "It is wonderful to call these men deserters, when it is notorious that they were driven away by the most barbarous violence, and what could be the sense of the word 'removed' in this case, but neither more nor less than rabbled? and what may the world think of the justice of parliament if it considers that sufficient ground to declare their churches vacant?" This general assembly abolished the administration of the Lord's supper to sick persons in their houses, and also private baptism in any place or at any time. These obstacles

¹ See Lawson's *Episcopal Church of Scotland*, vol. ii., p. 151.

to the reception of the sacraments caused the deprived episcopal ministers to be frequently invited to discharge these ministerial duties, and as they did not consider themselves bound by this act of the presbyterian general assembly, an act of parliament was passed in 1695 strictly forbidding any "outed minister to baptize any children or solemnize marriage betwixt any parties in all time coming, under pain of imprisonment until he find caution [security] to go out of the kingdom and never to return." This was the severest blow which had hitherto been aimed at the deprived episcopal clergy.

The government of the king did not wish difficulties to be thrown in the way of an arrangement with the Scottish non-jurors, but the management of ecclesiastical affairs had passed into the hands of the more bigoted class of presbyterians, so that the wishes of the crown were continually counteracted by them. During the whole of William's reign the episcopalians were discountenanced and their clergy subjected to many hardships, but the greater part of the nobility and landholders of ancient family continued strongly attached to episcopacy and afforded their clergy support and protection.

The harmony of the new establishment was at first disturbed by the countenance which it had bestowed upon the covenanters, who were a strongly republican class, most exclusive in their system of theology; they had always opposed any step towards reconciliation, and denounced the more sober part of the presbyterians as traitors. The latter body, who were more numerous and respectable, were little inclined to own these fanatics as members of the same communion; but, when presbyterianism was established at the accession of William III., it was deemed expedient to admit them to the management of affairs, and the moderator of the first general assembly in 1690 was selected from that violent faction. The followers of Cameron, however, were only courted for a time, while the covenant was gradually permitted to fall into oblivion, and a wiser spirit governed the kirk.¹

The English were irritated at the manner in which episcopacy was abolished in Scotland. In 1688 churchmen had generally declared themselves willing to give up many things for the sake of union, but that which was passing on the other side of the border proved union on any reasonable terms to be impossible. If, said they, we would know what the puritan spirit really is, we must observe the puritan when he is dominant. He was dominant in England in the last generation, and he drove hundreds of students from their colleges and thousands of divines from their parsonages because they refused to sign his covenant. No tenderness was shown to learning or sanctity. When at the restoration the puritan was in his turn subjected to pains and penalties, he found that it was barbarous to punish men for conscientious scruples, and so his complaints and his arguments in favour of toleration made even zealous churchmen hope that he had become moderate and charitable. But while we were considering how we

¹ Russell, vol. ii., p. 370—386.

could meet his wishes in England he had obtained ascendancy in Scotland, and was again bigoted and cruel. The clergy had been pelted, driven forth with their wives and children in the depth of winter, and their congregations dispersed with violence; the houses of the clergy had been sacked, churches shut up, prayer books burned; and was it reasonable to expect the Church of England to mutilate her beautiful liturgy for the purpose of conciliating those who want nothing but the power, to rabble her as they had rabbled her sister? They already worshipped God in security, and their meeting-houses were effectually protected. While no episcopal minister could officiate in the western counties of Scotland without putting his life in danger, presbyterian ministers could preach unmolested every Sunday in Middlesex. Toleration had been granted to most intolerant men, and with toleration they should be content. Such was the feeling and such were the sentiments which had been aroused in the minds of English churchmen by the violence of Scotch presbyterians.¹

Nor was it only in Scotland that the members of the Anglican communion suffered from the bigotry of their opponents. Persecution followed them in America, for the view which the independents took of toleration was sufficiently shown when they had established themselves in New-England and could act unchecked, as we have related in a former chapter. Long before the close of this century the members of the Church who had proceeded to the American colonies were greatly outnumbered by those of other persuasions in those parts. From one of these denominations especially they met with a violent and long-continued opposition. They were deprived of "freedom to worship God"² in their own way, since the dominant majority could not endure that the liturgy should be used. Heavy fines were inflicted on those who took part in the ceremonies of the Church; severe laws were enacted against the observance of Christmas or other church festivals, and the members of the Anglican communion were in many cases expelled from the colony.³

We must now retrace our steps in order to relate the affairs of Ireland. Though the country continued tranquil during the reign of Charles II., the antipathy between the native race and the English colonists had not diminished. The appellation of Irish was given only to the Celts, and to those settlers who had in the course of ages adopted Celtic manners. The native aristocracy retained their pride of birth, but had lost their wealth and power, for their lands had been divided by Cromwell amongst his military followers; and though a portion was given back at the restoration of Charles II., large tracts were still held by English settlers under act of parliament. The greater part of the old Irish gentry had left their country, and were scattered amongst the courts and

¹ Macaulay, vol. iii., p. 114.

² See the lines by Mrs. Hemans, quoted in a previous chapter.

³ Caswell's *History of the American Church*, p. 165.

camps of Europe. The feud which had raged between the native Irish and the Norman settlers had died out, but was succeeded by that far fiercer feud which separated both from the new protestant colonies. These colonies had their own disputes. The majority were English, but a large number were from the south of Scotland. Some belonged to the Anglican communion, some were dissenters. Still, they had a common language and a common interest. They were surrounded by the common enemy, and could only be safe by means of common exertions. Between them and the native population there was the inequality caused by the dominion of wealth over poverty, of knowledge over ignorance, of civilized over uncivilized man. If national animosity could be softened, there was some hope that religious animosity might fade away, but this would be a work of time.

James II., as an Englishman and a Roman catholic, seemed particularly qualified to be a mediator between the two classes, but instead of being a mediator he became a reckless partisan. His first act was to recall the duke of Ormonde. Ormonde's power had exceeded that of ordinary viceroys in Ireland on account of his rank and wealth in that kingdom, and because he was also commander of the army. James at first divided the power which Ormonde had possessed. Clarendon, the king's brother-in-law, an Englishman and a protestant, was appointed lord-lieutenant, and the general was Tyrconnell, a nobleman descended from one of those families of the pale which had adopted all the ways and prejudices of the native Irish, with whom he entirely sympathized. It was soon found that Tyrconnell exercised unbounded influence, and the colonists became greatly alarmed, for the native population far outnumbered them, and it was evident that Tyrconnell intended to remodel the regiments and to appoint Romanist officers and men in the place of protestants. In fact the people about him stated that in a very short time not a man of English race would be left in the army. In 1687 lord Clarendon, who had long been treated as a cypher, was recalled, and Tyrconnell assumed the government. His appointment spread dismay through the English population, and the colonists were placed under the feet of the natives; appeal to the law was vain, and the whole of the civil and military power of Ireland was placed in the hands of Romanists.¹

The downfall of James was regarded with very different feelings by the English settlers in Ireland, and by the natives. Londonderry was the great centre of protestantism. This town under its old name of Derry had suffered severely during the Irish insurrection in the reign of James I., but its ruined houses had been rebuilt, and as the lord mayor and aldermen of London assisted in the work of restoration, James made over to the corporation of that city the ruins of old Derry, and about six thousand acres of land in the neighbourhood. The new town which arose was called

¹ See Froude, vol. i., p. 166—178.

Londonderry. Its inhabitants were of English and Scotch birth, episcopalians and presbyterians, united by their common antipathy to the Irish race and the popish religion. In 1641 the city had held out against the native chieftains. In 1688 the inhabitants shared in the alarm which was general among the protestants in Ireland, and when they found that the earl of Antrim had been directed by Tyrconnell to occupy their city, and was marching thither with a regiment of papists, the alarm was extreme. Some were for closing the gates, some for submitting. At length Antrim's troops reached the opposite side of the river Foyle, when some of the officers crossed the ferry, and presenting themselves at the gate demanded quarters for his majesty's soldiers. At this moment thirteen young apprentices rushed forward, closed the ferry gate in the face of the officers, and let down the portcullis. The whole city was aroused; the other gates were closed; muskets and gunpowder were distributed. The protestants of the neighbourhood came by various roads into the city, and Antrim thought it prudent to retire. At Enniskillen a similar resistance had been offered to the admittance of popish troops, and Tyrconnell was enraged at the news. But tidings of the arrival of the prince of Orange in England had reached him, and he was obliged to affect for a time a moderation which he did not feel.

William, when he became king, entered into a negotiation with Tyrconnell, who at first seemed inclined to acknowledge his authority, but the feelings of the native Irish had been roused to fury, and caused him to prepare for the conflict, which was inevitable. The arming of the natives was universal, and by February, 1689, one hundred thousand were in arms, half of whom were soldiers and the rest a species of banditti. It is difficult to get an estimate of the property destroyed during this fearful period, as the protestant minority had been left unarmed in the midst of the hostile population and could not offer any effectual resistance to the terrible outbreak. Many families submitted, and were glad to escape with life, but the flower of the settlers in Munster and Connaught found shelter in Enniskillen, and those of Leinster took refuge in Londonderry. In both places William and Mary were proclaimed with enthusiasm, which colonel Lundy, who was the governor of Derry, could not venture to oppose. Tyrconnell's anxious desire to reduce Ulster to obedience induced him to send troops into that province. As they advanced, the settlers fled and at length thirty thousand protestants were crowded behind the walls of Derry.

James II., who had taken refuge in France, determined to try to retrieve his fortunes in Ireland, and in February, 1689, he landed at Cork; after visiting Dublin, he resolved to go into Ulster, it being confidently expected that on his arrival with the Irish troops Londonderry would at once surrender. The governor had proved himself a traitor by refusing the assistance of two English regiments which had been sent by sea to reinforce the garrison. James, confident of success, was approaching one of the city gates, when

he was met with a shout of "No surrender," and he and his staff hastened out of reach of the cannon balls. The inhabitants, much incensed with Lundy, removed him from his command, and he escaped in disguise by night from the city. His name is to this day held in detestation by the protestants of the north of Ireland. Two governors were appointed by the citizens—major Baker and the Rev. George Walker: the latter had been rector of a neighbouring parish, and had taken refuge in Londonderry. James now offered a free pardon to all the citizens if they would open the gates and submit to him as their sovereign. "The men of Londonderry," was the reply, "have done nothing that requires a pardon, and own no sovereign but king William and queen Mary." James returned to Dublin and the siege of Londonderry proceeded, but the defence was so vigorous and obstinate, and the shout of "no surrender" was followed up with such determined activity, that it was at last resolved to subdue it, if possible, by famine.

In the mean time James was holding a parliament in Dublin, and was urged on by his Irish followers to confiscate the property of protestants, and a bill of attainder was passed, in which were included between two and three thousand names belonging to the higher and most respectable classes in Ireland. These acts thoroughly completed the alienation of the English from James. There had been some reaction in his favour, but the reports of his tyranny in the sister country and the misery which the protestants experienced roused the national feeling, and an expedition for the relief of Londonderry was decided on. That city was closely invested, and the approach by the river strictly closed and guarded. Summer had arrived. The inhabitants had been thinned by famine and disease; the soldiers were so exhausted they could scarcely stand; the dogs and horses had been eaten; even rats were eagerly sought for food. The siege had lasted a hundred and five days, and the garrison was reduced from seven to three thousand men. Bravely had the resolution "no surrender" been carried out. At length deliverance came. On the 28th of July, as the sun was setting, the sentinels saw three English ships coming up the Foyle. The besiegers were on the alert; the river was low, and the barricade gave way at the shock of the gallant vessels, one of which grounded in the recoil, and the Irish prepared to board her; but her companion ships opened fire. Happily the tide was rising, and after a terrible time of suspense the besieged beheld the vessels at their quay. Provisions were quickly landed, and the devoted city and its brave inhabitants were saved.

Thus ended the memorable siege of Derry, the remembrance of which is still dear to the protestants of Ulster. On the summit of a lofty pillar has been placed the statue of George Walker: in one hand he holds a Bible and with the other seems to be pointing to the English vessels in the distance. The anniversary of the day on which the gates were closed, and that of the day on which the siege was raised, have been celebrated, and Lundy executed in effigy, for many succeeding years. The summit of the ramparts is

now a pleasant walk; the bastions have been formed into flower borders,¹ and while we hope that Londonderry will never forget her deliverance or the gratitude due to those who saved her, let us also trust that the animosities of those days have passed away never to return.

William III. landed in the north of Ireland in June, 1690, and the two rival princes collected their forces. James's army was decisively defeated in the battle of the Boyne; he himself retired to Dublin and shortly afterwards embarked on board a French frigate and returned to France, where he died in 1701.

William was aware that his title to the throne was not considered valid by a large body of churchmen, though they submitted quietly to his rule, and his indifference to the form of church government did not render him popular with men who felt strongly on the point. He showed the clergy as a body little favour, and treated them with coldness, while his latitudinarian principles and Calvinistic opinions were another cause of discontent. Until the time of the Revolution, says dean Hook, protestantism in England was the term used to designate a Church of England man; his opponents were puritans, Calvinists, presbyterians, and various other denominations. Jeremy Taylor, Ken, Patrick,² were proud of the title of protestant. But at the Revolution it was desired to find a term to designate all who made common cause against the court of James, and the Church of Rome. The term chosen was that of protestant. This has occasioned some confusion, as in the opinion of an Anglican, protestantism is opposed not to catholicism but to popery,³ whereas others who adopt the title of protestant are apt to confound these terms, and to forget that the Holy Catholic Church existed before popery arose.

Most of the bishops appointed during William's reign were chosen politically; Tillotson, archbishop of Canterbury, and Burnet, bishop of Salisbury, being the leading men of the whig and latitudinarian school. In their anxiety to propitiate dissenters, the distinguishing tenets of our Church were too much kept in the background, and this at a time when she should have given forth no uncertain sound. Scepticism and immorality very generally prevailed—the natural sequence of the overdrawn strictness of the puritans, followed by the licentiousness of the court and time of Charles II. The voice of the Church in convocation had not been heard since 1689. A long and violent controversy had ensued as to the constitutional right of the king to hinder the clergy from thus meeting to discuss ecclesiastical matters, when parliament met

¹ See Macaulay, vol. iii., ch. xii., for this account of the siege of Derry.

² Doctor Simon Patrick, bishop of Ely, was one of the most learned men of his time. During the reign of James II. he and another Anglican divine were appointed to defend their Church against two Romish priests in the presence of James. The king going off in anger during the argument, was heard to say, "He never heard a bad cause so well maintained." Patrick withstood all attempts to draw him from the English to the Romish Church, stating that he "could not give up so well-proved a faith." He died in 1707.

³ Dean Hook's *Lives of the Archbishops*.

for business of the state. Archbishop Tillotson, who was a great opponent of convocation, died in 1694. The queen wished the primacy to be bestowed on Stillingfleet, but William preferred Tenison, who succeeded to the see of Canterbury. Convocation met during the last two years of this reign, but disputes between the upper and lower houses prevented any good results.¹ These disputes were the natural consequence of the preponderance of latitudinarian views amongst the bishops, who had been selected during William's reign chiefly on account of their holding those views. The majority of the clergy were opposed to these opinions; they were sounder churchmen than their bishops, but this circumstance checked united action between the upper and lower houses of convocation at this time.

In Wales the deposed monarch had many friends, and the Welsh Church suffered in consequence. Her bishops were no longer chosen from the principality, but Englishmen who had no knowledge of the language were appointed to the Welsh sees. The practice which has now been happily broken through, may date from this period. English clergy were also in some cases appointed to Welsh parishes. These selections appear to have been made with the double view of discouraging Jacobite leanings and the native language; but their only result was a want of sympathy between the people and their spiritual teachers, and a consequent failure to revive religion, which had been already so unhappily checked by the "propagators" of the time of the commonwealth.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was founded in 1698; it was the first of those voluntary religious societies which have done so much to check vice and improve the morals of the nation. It was followed in 1701 by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, whose noble work in our colonies and distant dependencies has kept religion alive where it would otherwise have perished. We shall presently enter more fully into the rise and progress of these great church institutions.

The system of making public collections of money at the church doors was seldom if ever done before the Revolution. Money was previously raised only through parliament, or through convocation, through the offertory, or by means of letters patent from the crown. The dissenters commenced the system of charity sermons, and as the authorities did not interfere, the Church gradually followed the example.² The offertory is now regaining its proper position, and is admirably adapted to awaken and encourage charity amongst our congregations.

Chelsea hospital for old and disabled soldiers was founded by William and Mary; they also bestowed the palace at Greenwich upon the veterans of the navy. Greenwich had for a long time been the favourite residence of royalty.

One of the last acts passed in this reign was that of enjoining

¹ Blunt's *Key*.

² Dean Hook.

the "oath of abjuration," whereby the "pretended prince of Wales" was declared to have no right or title whatever to the crown of the realm, concluding with the words, "I do renounce, refuse, and abjure any allegiance or obedience to him." William died in March, 1702, having survived queen Mary eight years. Though a great soldier and statesman, he was not popular as a sovereign, and one of the principal causes of this unpopularity was his undisguised preference for his fellow-countrymen, the Dutch. His manners were stern and cold, and he was to the last a foreigner in speech, tastes, and habits, and did not endeavour to make himself acceptable to the people.¹ His tolerant spirit was a blessing to the kingdom, for though differences of opinion continued to exist, both in politics and religion, men had no longer the power of persecuting those who differed from them. The ease with which the act of toleration was passed seemed to point to the fact that Englishmen were weary of religious contentions. The influence of the king in this respect, however, was not successful in Scotland, as his northern presbyterian subjects were not sufficiently enlightened to tolerate the religious views of others.

On the death of William III., the crown devolved on Anne, the youngest daughter of James II. by his first marriage. She was thirty-eight years of age, and had married prince George of Denmark, by whom she had several children, but none of them lived to maturity. In her first speech to parliament she declared her intention of following the steps of the late king, her brother-in-law, in order to preserve both Church and state and maintain the succession in the protestant line. She was crowned in April, and immediately afterwards gave directions that the electress of Hanover, as next heir to the crown, should be named in the collect for the royal family. It will be remembered that this was Sophia, grand-daughter of James I.

When speaking of convocation we mentioned that the bishops who were appointed during the last reign had been selected from the whig and latitudinarian parties, and differed in this respect from the bulk of the parochial clergy, who generally belonged to the high church school. The party from which the prelates had been taken were disposed to lower the sacraments, to consider subscription to the articles of the Church unnecessary, and were willing to make so many concessions in order to conciliate the various sects that it is not surprising opposition was aroused. In their anxiety to avoid the intolerance of a former generation they were willing to set aside the distinctive doctrines of our Church.² Those who were of the high church party were not opposed to toleration, but they considered it their duty to continue steadfast to the rule and order, the services and rubrics of the Church. Hence arose a want of cordial feeling between the bishops and their clergy.

¹ Macaulay, vol. ii., p. 266. Burnet, vol. iii., p. 421.

² See Burnet, vol. iv., p. 410.

In 1705 the see of St. David's was given to doctor Bull, who had written a very learned book on the doctrine of the primitive Church concerning the Trinity, a work which was well received throughout Europe, and which was particularly acceptable at a time when Socinianism was prevalent. The queen had previously presented doctor Beveridge to the see of St. Asaph. He was an earnest and devout man, whose explanation of the Church catechism is an admirable work. The bishop says, "There is no such catechism set forth by any Church that doth or can exceed this of ours, which is so short that the youngest children may learn and say it by heart: and yet so full, that the oldest Christians need not know more than what they are there taught to believe and do, that they may be saved."

In 1706 the treaty of union between Scotland and England was concluded, by which the two countries were thoroughly incorporated and their parliaments united. Fears were expressed in parliament when the act was discussed lest presbyterian influence might produce evil results in legislation affecting the Church, and a suggestion was made that convocation should be consulted on the matter; but the synod was at once prorogued by the queen. On its re-assembling after the act of union had passed, the lower house protested against this invasion of their privileges, when the queen, influenced by archbishop Tenison, wrote to the upper house complaining of this protest as an invasion of the royal supremacy. The two houses had also disagreed respecting a cry which had arisen of the "Church in danger." Convocation was not again summoned till 1710.¹

Great discussion arose in 1709 respecting a sermon preached by doctor Hoadly before the lord mayor of London, on the first two verses of the thirteenth chapter of the Romans; in this sermon the doctrine of the divine right of kings was attacked, and high praise was bestowed on the Revolution and the government then established. The doctrine of passive obedience was still held by many, and a long controversy ensued. Hoadly's opinions in theology approached very nearly to those of the unitarians, and his writings had been previously disputed by doctor Francis Atterbury, afterwards bishop of Rochester.

People's minds were also much excited by two sermons by doctor Sacheverell in the same year, one being preached at the assizes at Derby, the other in St. Paul's cathedral. The doctor advocated passive obedience, spoke against Romanists and dissenters, said the Church was violently attacked by her enemies and loosely defended by her friends, and called upon the people to stand up for her defence. The queen was offended, and the government considered it as an attack upon them, more especially upon the lord treasurer Godolphin. The house of commons passed a resolution declaring these sermons (which had been printed) to be "scandalous and seditious libels reflecting upon her majesty and her government,

¹ Blunt's *Key to Church History*, p. 113. Burnet, vol. iv., p. 184.

the late happy Revolution and the protestant succession as by law established; and both houses of parliament." It is said that fully forty thousand copies were printed and dispersed all over the country. Sacheverell, who was hated by the whig and latitudinarian party, was impeached and tried at Westminster hall in February, 1710; his defence was said to have been written by his friend Atterbury. He was prohibited from preaching for three years, and his two sermons were ordered to be burnt by the common hangman.

Sacheverell was, however, hailed as the champion of the Church, and the populace, who had espoused his cause, rejoiced in the mildness of his sentence, and celebrated it with bonfires and rejoicings both in London and throughout the kingdom.¹ A few months afterwards he went to take possession of a living in Shropshire to which he had been presented, and his journey thither through Oxford and Warwick was a continued triumph. The cry raised was "The Church and Sacheverell," and it is admitted that the affair greatly influenced the elections which took place in the autumn, and hastened the downfall of the whig ministry.

Queen Anne was a great benefactor to the Church in one important point. We have frequently in an earlier part of this work spoken of first-fruits and tenths, and at the risk of some repetition we mention the nature and origin of these dues. Each clergyman who held a benefice or living was required to pay the first-fruits—that is to say, one year's profits of his living, and the tenths—that is to say, the tenth part of the annual profits afterwards, to the crown. The bishop of Rome had claimed and received these tenths throughout Christendom, but it was not till the reign of king John, 1199, that the papal claim was complied with in England, and then only partially so, but the popes gradually advanced their claims, and very large sums were thus drawn from the English Church to the Roman treasury. In the sixteenth century, when the authority of the popes ceased in our country, this revenue, though lost to Rome, was not restored to the clergy, but transferred by king Henry VIII. to the crown. Thus this heavy tax which had originally been imposed upon the Church by the popes, still continued to be levied, though for a different purpose. The revenue was collected by the bishops for the reigning prince; it appears to have been his private property for the time being, and was generally applied in pensions to deserving servants, favourites, or their friends, and sometimes for more questionable purposes. Mary on her accession restored the property to the Church, at the same time that she temporarily restored the papal power in England.

Parker, archbishop of Canterbury, wished queen Elizabeth to return this revenue to the Church, but to this she would not consent. The burden on the clergy was sometimes slightly eased, but the relief was trifling and partial. The right step, however, was at last taken by queen Anne, induced thereto by the influence

¹ See Burnet, vol. iv., p. 277—288.

of Burnet, bishop of Salisbury. She sent a message to the house of commons signifying her desire to give up the tenths and first-fruits, in order to form a fund for the augmentation of the small livings. The clergy were not released from the tax, but it was to be applied to the benefit of the Church. For the administration of this fund, which still exists, a corporation was formed in 1704, called the "governors of the bounty of queen Anne," and the trustees are certain dignitaries of the Church and other persons. In addition to the contributions of the clergy, the fund is open to gifts of money or land, and many such gifts have been made, a portion of the statute of mortmain having been repealed for that purpose. The income of queen Anne's bounty in 1874 was nearly £135,000, and in that year ninety-four livings were augmented by various grants. Thus at last the Church had that which was her own restored to her for the benefit of her poorer clergy. The funds are also employed in building and repairing churches and parsonage houses, either by way of gifts or loans of money for these purposes. Such is the history of the corporation which we call queen Anne's bounty.¹

Before referring to the other great church societies we must notice two that were founded for the benefit of the clergy. In 1665 an association was formed by a number of gentlemen, sons of clergymen, with the view of raising funds to assist those poor clergymen and their families who had been plundered, turned out of their houses, and plunged into distress and poverty during the time of the long parliament. This association was known as the 'Festival of the Sons of the Clergy.' It held a festival service in one of the London churches, when a sermon was preached and funds were raised for the purposes required. From the year 1674 the festival has been held annually without interruption, and the list of preachers contains the names of some of the leading divines of our Church. The sister charity dates from 1678. The distress and poverty which prevailed amongst the clergy, their widows and children, was still so great, and had been so largely occasioned by their fidelity to Church and king during the late national troubles, that Charles II., moved to sympathy with their sufferings, established by royal charter the society entitled, 'The Charity for the relief of poor Widows and Children of Clergymen,' better known now as the 'Corporation of the Sons of the Clergy.' This was at first distinct from the 'festival,' though it acted in concert with it. It worked zealously and well for the benefit of those whom it was intended to assist. At present it affords help to those clergymen who have become impoverished by circumstances beyond their own control; it grants pensions to the widows and unmarried daughters who are in absolute need of aid, and assists in the education of the children, whether orphans or not, of poor and necessitous clergymen. There

¹ Burnet, vol. iv., p. 42. See also *Sketches of Great Church Societies*, by the author of *Earth's Many Voices*, in the *Parish Magazine* for September, 1876, edited by the Rev. J. Erskine Clerk.

is great need of such assistance, and to relieve it is the joint purpose of the festival and corporation of the sons of the clergy.¹

In the reign of James II. private societies began to be formed, partly to guard against popery and partly to check the progress of vice and irreligion; many persons in and about London met for purposes of devotion, and came to their clergy to be assisted with forms of prayer and other directions. Their meetings were chiefly conducted by doctor Beveridge and doctor Horneck. After the Revolution these societies became more numerous, and collections were made to maintain clergymen who would read prayers in many places and at different hours, in order that devout persons might have frequent opportunities of devotion. Holy Communion was celebrated every Sunday in many churches, and larger numbers attended, and with greater appearance of devotion than had been observed for a long period. These societies informed the magistrates against swearers, drunkards, &c., and were hence called societies for reformation of manners. Some magistrates encouraged them, but others treated them roughly. Such beginnings seem to have prepared the way for the formation of one of our most valuable and influential church societies, so well known by its name, 'The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.'

In 1699, five members of the Church, whose names deserve to be immortalized, met together to consider what could best be done to check the irreligion and wickedness of the times. These were Francis lord Guildford; Sir Humphrey Mackworth, bart.; serjeant Hook; colonel Maynard Colchester; and the Rev. doctor Thomas Bray. They agreed that the work must be threefold. First, that the poor must be educated in the principles of the Christian Church. Second, that religion must be promoted in those distant lands which were under our dominion. Third, that the Bible and prayer book must be put within reach of all; together with a supply of pure and wholesome reading. This was no small undertaking, but the five set to work bravely. They were gradually joined by a number of churchmen—bishops, clergy, and laymen. It is interesting to trace the early efforts of this society in the cause of education; it was resolved at one of the first meetings of its members to commission one of their number, colonel Colchester, to find out three persons who would begin by setting up schools in three parishes. In the autumn of 1699, we find that five schools had been set on foot in the metropolis. The movement progressed rapidly. The archbishops and bishops recommended the clergy to promote the erection of charity schools, the catechizing of children, and family devotion. The clergy pursued these objects zealously: they put poor children to school at their own charge, and in some places part of the offertory money was employed for the purposes of education. The society's rules were that the schoolmasters should be members of the Church of England, of good character

¹ See in the *Parish Magazine* for August, 1876; *Great Church Societies*, by author of *Earth's Many Voices*.

and ability; that they should set apart two days in the week in which the children should learn by heart some of the most devotional psalms or other suitable portions of Scripture; that they should teach and explain the Church catechism; that there should be morning and evening prayers in the schools; that the children should be taught private prayers to be used at home on rising and going to rest; and that they should come to Church as often as opportunity occurred, and twice at least every Lord's day. A clergyman was appointed to inspect all the church schools in and about London. We thus see how the founders of this society carried out their great principle of promoting Christian knowledge by making religion the ground-work and chief purpose in education. In 1704, five years after its foundation, the society first celebrated its anniversary, when the boys and girls maintained at the London charity schools, numbering two thousand, walked two and two with their masters and mistresses and many of the parish clergy, to divine service in the church of St. Andrews, Holborn. From that time to the present the anniversary has been held in one of the London churches, and in 1782 they were collected for the first time under the dome of St. Paul's cathedral, where they have met every year since that time. The number of children brought together on these occasions is about four thousand five hundred. The whole congregation amounts usually to about twelve thousand; the chorus ascending from so many thousand children's voices is most impressive and affecting. A warm supporter of these charity schools from their commencement was Robert Nelson, an excellent non-juring layman, author of several works on divinity and other subjects. He was a bountiful contributor to the funds of the society, and until his death in 1714 his zeal and charity for all good objects were never relaxed. By the year 1741 nearly two thousand charity schools had been established in Great Britain and Ireland through the means of the S.P.C.K.

Thus was one of the threefold branches of work carried on; the second was soon found to require a separate society, and of that we shall presently speak. The third object brings us to the point in which the S.P.C.K. is now best known to us, as the society to which we owe the blessing of a very large supply of books for religious and general reading, and as the great Bible and prayer book society of the Church of England. Every poor child can now have its Bible, and prayer book, and its books of pleasant reading for a small price; every cottage wall can have its pictures and brightly painted texts, and for this the people have to thank the S.P.C.K. The society prints Bibles and prayer books in various languages, and distributes them throughout the world. It not only sells at low prices but it bestows many free gifts of books; our soldiers and sailors, our working-men's clubs, our emigrants, our parish libraries, all share in these advantages. We cannot add more to this sketch, but must pass over the hundred and eighty years during which its members have increased from five in number to many thousands, and proceed to trace the history of its offspring,

to whom the promotion of religion in our colonies and independencies was entrusted.

This, so well known by the name of the 'Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts,' or more familiarly as the S.P.G., numbers amongst its founders and earliest supporters, Sir George Wheeler, Sir John Chardin, John Chamberlayne, the well known John Evelyn, of Wotton, and Robert Nelson. The Rev. doctor Bray was as active a promoter of this as of the parent society, and with him more than any other man rests the honour of being the first to unfurl the banner of the cross for the Church of England in our distant dominions. He had wished in the year 1696 to found a society of this nature, and at the first meeting of the five members of the S.P.C.K. he requested to lay before them as soon as convenient "his scheme of promoting religion in the plantations," as our colonies were then called. Doctor Bray's means were small, but he devoted himself and his wordly substance to the spread of Christian truth, and was the most eminent as well as the most active in this labour of love. He crossed the Atlantic at his own cost, under a commission from doctor Compton, bishop of London, in order to advance religion in the American provinces.

In May, 1701, the draft of a charter was read at a meeting of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, the lower house of convocation having previously appointed a committee to consider the matter, and in June of that year William III. established by royal charter the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Since that time its presidents have been the archbishops of Canterbury. Its vice-presidents are the other prelates of the Church of England, and those of Ireland and the Scottish episcopal Church, as well as the colonial and missionary bishops of the Anglican communion. The mission of the S.P.G., as set forth in the charter, was to our colonies, but it was not restricted to our countrymen in those parts, and the work is extended to the heathen amongst whom they dwell, so that the colonial Church, which is the special work of the S.P.G., is made a centre from which the light of the gospel shines out over the dark places of the earth. In Maryland, where dr. Bray commenced his labours, an account published shortly afterwards says, "Sixteen clergymen have a competent maintenance, their glebes settled and libraries fixed; and many thousand devotional books have been dispersed among the people with good effect by the assiduous and pious care of the reverend doctor Bray." Queen Anne took an interest in both these church societies, and said, "I shall be always ready to do my part towards promoting and encouraging so good a work."

The first missionaries of the society sailed from England in 1702 and landed in North America, and for many years the chief field of the society's labours lay in those colonies which form the United States. Its work now extends to every land in which the English flag flies; and when we consider that our entire colonial empire is equal to one-seventh of the earth's surface, we see what a mighty

agent for good is the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. Some of the missionaries whom it supports are native clergy, and at Calcutta, where some deacons were ordained priests in the cathedral in 1873, the services and sermons were given in their own tongue, and the choir was composed of native Christian boys. The society assists in training and supporting native missionaries, and for this purpose builds schools and colleges. Besides this it takes part in maintaining clergy for duty amongst emigrants and seafaring people; it assists in providing colonial and missionary bishoprics, so that all things may be done under the guidance and help of a spiritual head. It does not give a permanent support to the work which it has begun: its wisdom is seen in forming or helping to form a church establishment, which it continues to assist till it can support itself, then withdrawing to pursue the same course in other places. Wide is its mission field and faithfully is its mission performed.¹

In the beginning of Anne's reign the Scottish parliament passed an act declaring it high treason to endeavour to alter the presbyterian form of worship as by law established. This had often been proposed in the previous reign, but William would not consent to it. Anne's accession alarmed the presbyterians, as she was known to prefer episcopacy, while it encouraged the suffering clergy to entreat her majesty "to compassionate them and their numerous families, who were reduced to a starving condition for adhering to that Church of which her majesty was a member." The questions involved in the oath of abjuration passed at the close of the last reign had proved a stumbling-block to many who were friendly to the Revolution, and were an additional burden to those episcopalians who had become non-jurors. The queen, pitying the distress of the petitioners, assured them of her protection and promised to do all in her power to provide for their necessities. Her good intentions were however frustrated, for a proposal in the Scotch parliament to grant toleration to all protestants in their religious worship excited great indignation amongst the presbyterians, and the general assembly presenting a violent remonstrance, the bill was accordingly dropped.²

The use of the Book of Common Prayer was at this time becoming very general in the episcopal chapels in Scotland, and a supply was sent free of expense by some benevolent persons in England, who pitied the condition of their northern brethren. In the meantime the queen, and all who wished well to the country generally, were endeavouring to accomplish a union of the two kingdoms. This was opposed by the more rigid presbyterians, as they alleged that their kirk would be exposed to danger from the superior influence of episcopacy in England joined to that of the higher classes in Scotland. To remove this alarm an order was issued command-

¹ For further details see the very clear and interesting *Sketches of Great Church Societies*, by the author of *Earth's Many Voices* in *Parish Magazine* for 1876. Published by W. Wells Gardner.

² Russell, vol. ii., p. 387.

ing all the chapels in Scotland to be closed. Had such a despotic measure been adopted towards the covenanters during the reigns of Charles and James, the privy council would have been denounced and defied. But the episcopalians showed that their principles made them a law-abiding people. The places of worship were closed and the clergy retired into domestic life. This cloud, however, did not continue long, for after the union we find that episcopal congregations had again assembled in Edinburgh. During Anne's reign a marked change took place in the degree of influence exercised by the episcopal clergy over the higher ranks.¹ We have the testimony of the historian of the covenanters, Wodrow, who says, 1709, "I find a woeful disrelishing of presbyterian government; I believe episcopacy without ceremonies would be fallen in with by too many;" and again, "The English service is setting up very busily in the north, &c., to the great grief of our brethren." The adoption of the Anglican liturgy was denounced in the general assembly, and the government was called upon to interfere. Several episcopal clergy in Edinburgh were prosecuted by the magistrates in 1708, and expressly prohibited from exercising any part of their ministerial functions under pain of imprisonment.²

Various omissions had by this time occurred in the services of the Presbyterians. The Lord's prayer, which had been recommended in the directory, was seldom said, and a regular course of reading from the Holy Scriptures enjoined in the same was neglected. A better style of vocal music was violently opposed. Baptism was in many cases administered in private, and the Lord's supper was administered at very long intervals.³

In 1709 a chapel was opened in Edinburgh by the Rev. Mr. Greenshields, who had been ordained by one of the Scotch "deprived" bishops soon after the Revolution, and had since been in the diocese of Armagh, where he had taken all the required oaths, and was in the habit of praying for the queen and Sophia electress of Hanover by name. He found that a number of English families had come to reside in Edinburgh, who had to fill certain official situations in consequence of the union, and had agreed to perform divine service for them according to the usage of their national Church. It is probable that they chose his ministrations instead of those of the native episcopal clergy, because they were thus free from the accusation of showing favour to a communion which had not yet been even tolerated by government. No sooner, however, had Mr. Greenshields commenced his ministrations than the presbytery of Edinburgh summoned him to their bar "to give an account of himself." He produced his orders and testimonials approved by the primate of Ireland and two other bishops; and having, as he supposed, given them satisfaction that he was no

¹ Russell, vol. ii., p. 387—392. Grub, vol. iii., p. 370.

² See Lawson's *Scottish Episcopal Church*, vol. ii., p. 190—194, and Wodrow's *Analecta*, vol. iii., p. 218. Also his correspondence printed for the Wodrow Society, vol. i., p. 30, both quoted by Lawson.

³ Grub, vol. iv., pp. 83, 84.

vagabond but belonged to the communion of the Church of England, he considered that he was not subject to their jurisdiction, and therefore declined their authority. He was, however, informed that if he presumed to perform divine service again, he would be put in prison, and this sentence was soon afterwards executed by the magistrates; besides which the commission of the general assembly set forth an act "against innovations," stating "that the form, purity, and uniformity of worship, as now established, is to continue, without any alteration, in all succeeding generations;" and presbyteries were desired to prosecute the innovators and to apply to the civil magistrate to render their censures effectual. This act, as may easily be imagined, led to most oppressive intolerance—an intolerance all the more inexcusable since it was directed entirely against religious principles. In the days of the covenanters the privy council had reason to know that political opinions were largely mixed up with the ostensible ones of faith and worship; but in the reign of Anne, treason and the liturgy could have no connection, and this was a war against liberty of conscience.

It is fortunate for the reputation of the presbyterian Church of Scotland, that she never possessed sufficient power to carry out her desire of driving from the land what she considered heresy and schism. King William had before interposed in defence of the episcopalians, and queen Anne and her government at length saw the necessity of protecting them by law; a remedy which Mr. Greenshield's case had impressed upon them, though an attempt had been made to justify the severity employed towards him on the ground that his orders were not valid, as he was ordained by a "deprived" bishop.

In March, 1712, therefore, the act of toleration was passed in the parliament of the united kingdom, and thus the Scottish episcopalians obtained that relief which had been denied to them by their own parliament. This act also repealed that which had been passed in Scotland, forbidding them to administer the sacrament of baptism or solemnize marriages, and it imposed a fine of £100 on all who should disturb them and their congregations during the performance of public worship. A happy and peaceful time seemed to be dawning on the episcopalian Church, but the death of queen Anne in 1714 entirely changed the state of affairs, for on the accession of George I., a proclamation was issued by the new government for putting the laws in execution against all papists, non-jurors, &c. This excited general discontent; and insurrections in England and Scotland in behalf of the exiled royal family were the result, until the Jacobite rising of 1745 caused a more stringent statute to be passed respecting the oath of allegiance.¹

¹ Lawson's *Episcopal Church of Scotland*, p. 196—204. Russell, vol. ii., p. 387—398. Grub, vol. iii., p. 361—368.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

CENTURY XVIII.

GEORGE I., A.D. 1714. RELIGION IN WALES. REV. GRIFFITH JONES.
SCOTLAND. SEVERITY TOWARDS THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH THERE.
THE WESLEYS.

GEORGE I., the son of Sophia, electress of Hanover, was very unacceptable to high churchmen, and his foreign tastes and habits were not calculated to make him popular with the nation at large. Dr. Hoadly, whose leanings to Socinianism had become evident in the previous reign, was appointed to the see of Bangor in 1715. Soon afterwards he published two treatises, in one of which he denied the value of episcopacy and church ordinances; and in the other the existence of a visible church and the right of any interference in matters of faith. A committee of the lower house of convocation at once drew up a severe censure on the bishop's statements, pointing out their irreligious tendency, and begging the archbishop of Canterbury (doctor Wake) and the upper house to confirm this censure. This would no doubt have been done; but convocation was at once prorogued by government in 1717, and from that period until the reign of the present queen the meetings of these synods of the Church were reduced to a mere form. However the "Bangorian controversy," as it was called, was carried on elsewhere and was long and active, the government showing its partisanship by removing four of the royal chaplains who wrote against Hoadly. The latitudinarian tendency of the age now brought forth its natural fruit, and Socinianism gained ground even amongst the bishops and clergy; its encouragement in the high places of the land caused the publication of many books and pamphlets advocating these views. Controversial writings on the fundamental truths of Christianity prevailed, and distinctive church teaching was neglected. Infidelity too was becoming prevalent, and immorality was its necessary consequence.¹

The following facts relative to convocation may be interesting. Whenever a new parliament is elected the crown issues a writ desiring the archbishop to call his convocation together, upon which he issues his mandate and the convocation is assembled. It lasts as long as the parliament, and is dissolved with it. The meetings are arranged by the archbishop, and must take place while parliament is sitting. It is a legislative assembly, and is called upon to advise the crown on church matters when necessary. When "letters of business" are issued to convocation by the crown, it is required to report upon the matter named in the letters. As a provincial synod convocation may be said to have existed from early times, and the silencing

¹ Blunt's *Key to Church History*, p. 113.

of this ecclesiastical assembly during the last century was an abuse of power by the state which could not be carried out during the more active religious life of the present day. Convocation is part of the machinery of Church and state, and has filled an important place in the history of the Church of England. The convocations of Canterbury and York sit separately under their respective archbishops, which occasions some delay in carrying their joint decisions.

George II., who succeeded his father in 1727, brought no better influence to bear upon the country; but a religious revival began to take place, and this had a wonderful effect in checking the tide of unbelief. But before entering on its progress in England we must look back a little in order to consider the state of Wales.

The condition of religion in the principality may in some degree be anticipated from the lamentable hindrance to its progress which was caused by the civil war and other disturbances during the previous century. Closed churches and illiterate teachers were not calculated to "propagate the gospel," which the commission sent into Wales at the time of the commonwealth professed to do; neither the educated nor the working classes were benefited; but irreligion and ignorance increased with their usual accompaniments of vice and immorality. The Church suffered long and severely from the effects of the blow she then received. In 1671 the Rev. Thomas Gouge, who had been rector of a church in London, endeavoured to improve religious knowledge in Wales. He established schools for poor children in some of the towns. These schools increased, "so that by the year 1674," says the Rev. Griffith Jones, "above eight hundred poor children had been put to school by the charities of English gentlemen. This by a happy emulation provoked divers of the better sort of Welsh gentry to put above five hundred of the poorest Welsh children to school upon their own account."¹ These schools were annually visited by Mr. Gouge, who also obtained copies of the Bible in Welsh, distributing several gratis and causing the rest to be sold at a low price. He was assisted in his work by dean (afterwards archbishop) Tillotson, who preached his funeral sermon in 1681.

We have already mentioned that after the revolution of 1688 the Welsh clergy and gentry continued attached to the Stuart dynasty, and, it being thought difficult to fill the sees and the higher posts of the Church with Welshmen who had no Jacobite leanings, it was deemed expedient by the government to place English bishops, and in many cases English clergy, in Wales. The hope of causing the native language to fall into disuse was another reason for this measure, for it was thought that English services conducted by English clergy would assist this result. There could not have been a greater mistake, which originated not with the Church, but with the government and the politics of the day.

A great work of religious reform was begun in South Wales

¹ *A Further Account of the Circulating Welsh Schools*, by the Rev. Griffith Jones, rector of Llanddowror. London: 1742,

by one whose name and merits are too little known at present in the principality. We speak of the Rev. Griffith Jones, whose apostolic labours met with so large a measure of success. This excellent man was born in the parish of Cilrhedyn, Carmarthenshire, and educated at the grammar school in Carmarthen; but whether he took his degree at either of the universities, the materials with which we are supplied do not inform us. He was ordained by doctor Bull, bishop of St. David's, in 1708, and appointed to the parish of Llandilo-Abercowyn, Carmarthenshire, in 1711, and to that of Llanddowror in the same county in 1716. Mr. Jones was in the habit of catechizing his people after the second lesson in the service which he gave on Saturday, preparatory to holy communion on the following day. On these occasions adults of various ages as well as children were examined in the Church catechism and simple gospel truths; but finding that many of those who had grown old in ignorance were ashamed to be thus publicly taught, he devised a plan by which he could instruct them without wounding their feelings. The money received at the communion offertory was laid out by him in bread for the poor, and when the people came to receive it he took the opportunity of putting a few extremely plain and easy questions, with great gentleness, being cautious not to perplex them or give them cause to blush at their ignorance. By this plan the number of his older catechumens increased, and they came willingly, while he was able to fix in their minds the plain doctrines of Christianity and induce them to commit to memory a few verses of Scripture. He thus became acquainted with the great ignorance of the poor people and their inability to read, which sad discovery gave him, as he said, "great thoughts of heart and painful concern;" and finding the case to be much the same in other places, and that the difficulty of instruction was much enhanced by this deficiency, Mr. Jones devised a scheme whereby he hoped to stir up and encourage a desire for learning both in young and old. This was by means of circulating charity schools—a system hitherto unknown—in which instruction was given in the Welsh language. As it was impossible to establish permanent schools in all the districts requiring them, he thought he could meet the necessities of the case by placing schools in different parts for a certain limited time, where the poor might be taught, free of expense, to read their own language, and where they might be instructed in the first truths of the Christian religion. Schools for the poor were by no means uncommon in England, and many had been established, as we have mentioned, by the Society for Promoting Christian knowledge.

When these circulating charity schools were first established, about 1730, there seemed little prospect of success; but they were afterwards found to answer beyond all expectation. They were intended to prepare the poor and ignorant people and their children to receive further instruction from their clergyman. The schoolmasters were directed to have morning and evening prayer, to teach their scholars to read the word of God in their native language, to instruct them in the words and meaning of the church catechism,

and to teach them their duty to God and man. They were also to teach them to sing a psalm, and answer the responses reverently in divine service, and were desired to bring their scholars to the parish church. Each master was supplied with a copy of these rules. The men qualified for the work of teaching were to be communicants of the Church of England, and the clergyman of the parish in which they were placed was requested to take charge of both master and scholars, in order to see that the latter were duly instructed, and that if any masters were negligent or disorderly they might be dismissed. By these arrangements their founder hoped that the undertaking might "defy calumny and slander, while the schools were conducted agreeably to the teaching of the Church." Mr. Jones set a great value on catechizing, which, as he says, "was practised by all the primitive Christian churches," and he observes that all men who, "without prejudice, will consider the five principal parts of our catechism, must allow them to be very methodical and proper to introduce knowledge—namely, the baptismal covenant, the creed, the ten commandments, the Lord's prayer, and the two sacraments."

The English language was at this time very little understood by the poorer class, and even those who spoke it did so in a very broken and imperfect manner, and were unable to understand English books or preaching, whereas they could learn to read their own language in a few months. We have before us a very interesting and impressive letter addressed by Mr. Griffith Jones to a brother clergyman in 1744, which was printed in the following year.¹ It appears to have been published for the purpose of doing away with the prejudices which a plan so new to his countrymen had occasioned. Besides giving an account of the rise of these schools, with which the honoured name of Griffith Jones will always be associated, the letter contains a striking picture of the moral and religious condition of the country—the poorer classes ignorant of the first principles of religion; the upper classes paying little or no attention to even its outward forms, while profligacy and scepticism were the rule rather than the exception. Many of the clergy were illiterate, and therefore did not command the respect of the laity; the parish churches were badly attended, and those who were present seemed as if they hardly understood their duty in God's house. The neglect of catechizing is much enlarged on in this letter, and the necessity for its re-introduction as the best means to instruct and reform the ignorant and depraved, adding as an argument in its favour its use amongst all converts in primitive Christian churches and the authority of our own Church for the custom. An earnest appeal is made to those whose duty it was to assist in the work of reformation; and it is remarked that the mischief which occurs through their negligence will be charged upon themselves. Mr.

¹ *A Letter to a Clergyman on the Necessity of Instructing Poor and Ignorant People and of catechically teaching them in the Principles of Religion in Circulating Charity Schools.* Printed by M. Downing, Bartholomew-close, London, 1745.

Jones observes that catechizing imparts more knowledge than listening even to good sermons. He says that these schools were carefully visited by many of the clergy, who urged their people to learn to read the word of God, and explained and applied the catechism with Scriptural proofs; and he adds that as it is our duty to pray that "God's ways may be known upon earth," so should all use their utmost endeavours to bring that to pass. He laments that the curates had too many duties to fulfil, that many clergy were non-resident, and that sermons were preached in English to Welsh congregations; and he calls upon his countrymen to follow the example set by many persons of rank in England, who laboured to promote Christian knowledge and propagate the gospel. "Why," he says, "should not the zeal of others provoke us? Whilst they labour in the vineyard, shall we for want of labouring suffer this corner of it to grow wild and uncultivated?"

This good clergyman could not support his schools unaided. He received considerable help from benevolent Englishmen, as well as from friends in Wales; the most noted of the latter was Mrs. Bevan, resident in, and a native of, Carmarthenshire, who liberally placed part of her income at his disposal. Mr. Jones published an annual report of the progress and work of his schools from the year they were established to that of his death in 1761. In the last year they numbered two hundred and fifteen, and the scholars amounted to eight thousand six hundred and eighty-seven.

Nor was this the only benefit conferred by this remarkable man on his native land. There was no printing press in Wales before the year 1719, when Isaac Carter, of Trefhedyn, printed a book at Newcastle-Emlyn;¹ and a printing press existed in Carmarthen in 1723. There were not many educational or religious books in the Welsh language; the Welsh Bible was also scarce. Through the influence of Mr. Griffith Jones, with friends in England, the S.P.C.K. printed two large editions of the Scriptures for distribution, besides providing him with books for his schools, and he translated and composed many useful works, of which, through the assistance of this society, a vast number were printed and distributed through all parts of the principality. The explanation of the baptismal portion of the Church catechism and the creed, which was written by the Rev. Griffith Jones in Welsh, was also printed for him by the society, and is still on their list. Full of Scripture proofs, plain and practical, it was well suited to those for whom it was written, and was used by many of the Welsh clergy within the last thirty years for the purpose of catechetical instruction.

The energies of Mr. Jones were not confined only to education or works for the press. As a preacher, he was very successful, and wherever he occupied the pulpit vast numbers flocked to hear him, for he had obtained great influence by means of his schools, and

¹ Wrexham claims the honour of having printed a book in 1718, but the claim is doubtful.

his ministry was greatly blessed. Some of his sermons have been translated into English, and though, says his translator, they are suited to the capacity of the illiterate, they are full of matter, and show a clear and vigorous mind.

This exemplary clergyman died at the house of his friend, Mrs. Bevan, in 1761, aged 77. His schools were supported and organized for twenty years afterwards by that admirable lady, and at her death she left the sum of £10,000 in the hands of trustees for their support. Her heir-at-law claimed the property, and an appeal was made to the court of chancery, where the matter remained for so many years, that by the time it was settled in favour of the schools, it had accumulated to £30,000. The litigation was unfortunate, for it does not appear that there was sufficient public spirit in Wales to keep up the schools during the interval; but after the lawsuit was decided they were re-established, and according to the original plan they circulated from parish to parish in South Wales until the last few years, when it was decided that the interest of the sum would be more usefully employed by being distributed yearly amongst such church schools as are in need of assistance.¹

Thus the Welsh poor in South Wales were enabled to read their Bible in their native language through the exertions of the vicar of Llanddowror and that good churchwoman Mrs. Bevan. But the works and life of Griffith Jones are little mentioned in the principality at the present time, and appear to be unknown to many, whilst the labours of the Welsh dissenters during the last century are brought prominently forward. We would not undervalue those labours; but Welshmen should not forget nor be ignorant of the names and exertions of Griffith Jones and his generous friend Mrs. Bevan.

We said that the Jacobite rising in Scotland in 1715 in favour of the son of James II., called the Pretender, disturbed the peace which the episcopal Church had at last obtained. After the excitement was over, however, that Church seems to have again enjoyed a considerable degree of prosperity;² her ministers were numerous and many of them learned; her chapels were frequented by both peers and peasants. This internal peace was further improved by the spirit which now began to animate the presbyterian establishment. Intolerance and bigotry were passing away; the feelings of triumph on one side and disappointment on the other had cooled down, and both parties were led to the exercise of forbearance. In 1743 the bishops formed themselves into a synod, when they passed a number of canons, setting forth the constitution of their Church and rules for administering her affairs. But a sad reverse was at hand. In 1745 the attempt of prince Charles Edward to regain the throne of his grandfather James II., involved many episcopal families in utter ruin, and proved almost fatal to the episcopal Church on account of the sympathy known

¹ For this account of the Rev. Griffith Jones, see the letter previously named, also *Life of Rev. T. Charles, of Bala*, by Rev. Ed. Morgan, p. 324. Also *Memoir of Rev. Daniel Rowlands*, by Rev. John Owen, p. 35.

² Grub, vol. iv., p. 81.

to exist between the clergy and laity of that communion and the exiled house of Stuart. The unfortunate young prince, who stole the hearts of lowlanders as well as highlanders, and for whom some of the best blood of Scotland was shed, may be considered the last royal personage for whom that passionate personal devotion of loyalty existed which found expression in such touching songs and ballads as the well known

“ Charlie, Charlie, wha would na follow thee?
King o’ the Hieland hearts,
Bonnie Prince Charlie ! ”

After the insurrection was subdued and the victory of Culloden had scattered all opposition, vengeance was specially directed to the episcopal communion. Their chapels were burnt down or destroyed, the vestments and sacramental plate were seized as plunder, the clergy were compelled to seek safety in flight or concealment, and in some instances their Bibles and prayer books were committed to the flames.

In 1746 an act of parliament was passed providing that any episcopal clergyman who exercised the ministerial office in any of their “ meeting-houses ” after September 1st, without registering his letters of orders and taking all the oaths required by law, and praying for king George and the royal family by name, should for the first offence suffer six months’ imprisonment; and “ for the second be transported to some of his majesty’s plantations for life.” Every house in which five or more persons besides the family, or five persons if the house were not inhabited, met for worship performed by an episcopal minister, was declared to be a “ meeting-house ” within the meaning of the act, and no letters of orders except such as had been given by some bishop of the Church of England or Ireland were allowed to be registered after September 1st. The act further declared that any person who resorted to any episcopal meeting not held according to law, or who did not give notice of such meeting within five days, should be subject to fine or imprisonment; that no Scotch peer should be elected one of the representative peers of parliament, or be capable of voting for one, and that no person should be elected a member for any county or borough, or vote at such election, who should within a year previously have been twice present at any episcopal meeting not held according to law.

In this state of things some of the episcopalian clergymen felt it to be their duty to legalize their chapels by taking the prescribed oaths and having their letters of orders registered. But this was of no avail, for in May, 1748, the former act of parliament was altered, and it was declared that no episcopal minister was qualified to act as such in Scotland, whether he had complied with the previous act or not, unless his letters of orders had been granted by an *English or an Irish bishop*. This act was directly levelled against Scottish episcopacy; it amounted to persecution and was an attempt to crush the Church entirely. It was felt to be such by

the English bishops, not one of whom voted for the bill, while some spoke strongly against it as a flagrant attack on the principles of Christian liberty; and it passed the house of lords by a majority of only five after great exertions by the government.

By this severe statute the clergy suffered greatly; some were imprisoned, some came into England, while the greater number left the country altogether and went to the colonies of North America. All appearance of public worship by the Scottish episcopalians was now avoided. Sometimes the clergy, who had remained, visited families in private and celebrated the rites of their Church in secrecy; sometimes they met the more resolute of their adherents in the lofts of ruined stables and cow-houses, which were approached only by moveable ladders and trap-doors, placed under the charge of some watchful friend. In the register of the episcopal chapel at Muthill is the following entry after a baptism, "The penal laws were executed with such severity at this time that we could not take the child into a house, but I was obliged to go under the cover of the trees in one of lord Rollo's parks to prevent our being discovered, and baptize the child there."

At the present day the traveller in one part of Scotland may visit the wild caves in which the covenanters shunned the pursuit of Claverhouse and Dalziel, and in other parts, especially in the towns north of the Forth, he may see the miserable garrets where, during the time of their adversity, a few concealed worshippers belonging to the Scottish episcopal Church were wont to assemble.¹

Meanwhile the deadness and coldness of religious life which had affected England more or less since the accession of William III. began to disappear, and give place to warmth and zeal. To account for this improvement we must relate the career of the leader of the religious revival in England in this century—the celebrated John Wesley, who was born in 1703, the son and grandson of clergymen—his father being the rector of Epworth in Lincolnshire. John, with his younger brother Charles, was educated at Oxford, where he became a fellow of Lincoln college.

During the falling away of faith and zeal which had taken place both amongst churchmen and dissenters, there had been some bright exceptions. Amongst the former we have already mentioned the founders of the two venerable church societies which were doing good work; and amongst the dissenters were the honoured names of doctors Watts and Doddridge; but these were not sufficient to move the masses, or to warm the feelings of the higher classes, where laxity of morals and indifference to religion (encouraged by

¹ Russell, vol. ii., p. 398—406. The presbyterians of Scotland are indebted to her ancient bishops for some of their chief seats of learning. Bishop Wardlaw, of St. Andrews, founded the university in that city, A.D. 1413. Bishop Kennedy, of St. Andrews, founded the college of St. Salvator there in 1456. These foundations are now united. Bishop Turnbull founded the university of Glasgow, A.D. 1452, and bishop Elphinstone that of Aberdeen towards the close of the same century.—See *History of St. Andrews*, by Rev. C. J. Lyon, M.A.

the bad example of the courts of George I. and II.) were lamentably prevalent. Mention has been made of the societies for the reformation of manners which were established towards the close of the previous century; it appears that there were about forty of these in London in 1699; they were named by the archbishop of Canterbury in his charge to his clergy. One at least of these societies existed at Oxford in 1727, and amongst its members were the young divinity students, John and Charles Wesley, with some few others. It was called in derision the "godly" or "sacramentarian club," and the nickname "methodist" was also applied, as it had often been applied before to those who were stricter than their neighbours. George Whitfield, who was at Pembroke college, Oxford, says he felt "strongly pressed to follow their good example when he saw them go through a ridiculing crowd to receive the holy eucharist at St. Mary's." Whitfield afterwards joined the society.¹

After his ordination, John Wesley was for a time curate to his father; and on returning to Oxford he took a leading part in the religious society, and extended its work to the visiting of the poor and the prisoners in the gaol. The members adhered to the full system of the Church; the books of devotion which they studied were *Holy Living and Dying*, by bishop Jeremy Taylor, the writings of William Law, whose *Serious Call to a Devout Life* has had great influence on many minds, and the *Imitation of Christ*, which always continued a favourite book of Wesley.

In 1734 the opportunity offered of succeeding his father at Epworth, and Wesley consulted the bishop on the subject of undertaking parochial work, who replied "that it did not appear to him that at his ordination he had engaged to undertake the care of any parish, provided he could, as a clergyman, better serve God and his Church in his present or some other station." John Wesley seems to have applied this remark more widely than was intended. He afterwards alluded to his fellowship as affording him a maintenance and an office distinct from the obligation of serving in any one parish, and seems to have considered that he had a vocation for missionary work. In 1735, he, with his brother Charles, embarked for the new colony of Georgia, under the direction of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, but they were not successful in their mission; one source of failure is said to have been the extreme rigour with which they enforced their own views of discipline. In 1738, Wesley returned to England; but the time which he had spent abroad had not been lost, as he had seen and studied much in the interval. He had become acquainted with members of the ancient episcopal Church of the "united brethren" or Moravians, and there were points in connection with them which made a deep impression on his mind. Their usages (as they considered) were derived from primitive sources, their personal excellence and self-

¹ For this account of Wesley see *John Wesley's Place in Church History*, by B. Denny Urlin, barrister-at-law, a most interesting volume.

devotion were evident, and their Church was a missionary rather than a stationary one. This led Wesley to study the history of the early eastern Church, together with many other branches of theological literature. He studied Lutheran and Calvinistic writers, but disliked the school of Calvin, and described their books as intended to show that God was not loving to every man, and that redemption was not offered to all; and he considered both Luther and Calvin "magnified faith to such an extent that it hid all the rest of the commandments, through an overgrown fear of popery." Wesley's restless and inquiring mind was apt at this period to run into extremes, and this study of opposite schools of theology led him for a time into perplexities, but in the end his religious opinions and system gained something from all. He gave due weight to the writings of the fathers and the canons of the early Church, and looked to the undivided Church of the first centuries for example and instruction.

The members of the little society at Oxford were called "sacramentarians," for constant attendance at the Holy Communion was then regarded as fanaticism, and this notion has required nearly a century for its gradual extirpation. John Wesley and his friends, in fact, anticipated the Oxford church revivalists of the nineteenth century in advocating weekly communion; and on this point Wesley remained to the last unchanged. He considered that as the population of the country had greatly increased, especially in the mining and manufacturing parts, it had outgrown the parochial system; and that, admirably as that system had been at first arranged, more was now required to meet the spiritual necessities of the times. The churches were fitted with square pews, an innovation dating from the days of the commonwealth, and these, being used by the gentry, left no room and gave no invitation to artisans, fishermen, or colliers. There was, in fact, a low moral and religious condition of the English population in 1739, in which year it was that John Wesley's energy and zeal led him to commence his mission work in England by preaching in the open air to those who did not, and were not likely, to enter a church. His friend George Whitfield had previously commenced field-preaching. If the stirring words of Whitfield were well adapted for arousing his hearers, the wisdom of Wesley was equally useful in rendering the impression lasting. In commencing his work as an evangelist, Wesley's desire was to supplement the services of the Church and to give greater variety and completeness to her system. He considered himself at liberty to introduce such innovations as, not being forbidden by it, were justified by primitive example. Both brothers saw the need of church revival; nor were they entirely alone in this opinion; and they also saw that the exigences of the times required special gospel messengers and extra means to awaken the careless, enlighten the ignorant, and reform the scoffer.

John Wesley's further plan of supplementing the church system by a network of private societies was speedily carried out, of which the early Oxford association had doubtless given him the idea. He

intended the rules and discipline of his societies to resemble those of the primitive Church, and became their director, assisted by his brother Charles. No one ever gave himself more entirely to any object or prosecuted it with more zeal, method, and skill. He saw that the churches were inefficiently served, and that non-residence and plurality of livings was one of the evils of the day. It will be remembered that in the reign of queen Elizabeth it was necessary to place more than one benefice under the care of the same clergyman in consequence of the scarcity of parochial ministers. Unhappily the practice was continued after the necessity for it had passed away. Thus rectors or vicars, who occupied these pluralities, employed curates at small stipends who gave one service on the Sunday, in perhaps two or three different churches, so that many parishes had little or no supervision.

The two brothers were joined by a few of the clergy, and very many churches were open to their preaching, though some few incumbents, as their work proceeded, repelled them from Holy Communion. The Wesleys regarded preaching as their special calling, as the instrument for which the work of drawing sinners to Christ, and giving fresh life to the Church they loved, was to be accomplished. They considered that they were driven to preach in the open air for want of room in the churches to contain the vast number of people who thronged to listen. Still, they were unwilling to incur the responsibility of varying from the order of their Church, and made several attempts to obtain episcopal sanction for their new mission. They waited from time to time upon the bishop of London and the archbishop of Canterbury, asking their advice and instruction, and answering charges which were made against them. These dignitaries were often at a loss how to proceed; neither liking to sanction the irregularities of the brothers, nor to deal harshly with men whose intentions were pure and whose churchmanship could not be doubted.

The "foundry" at Morfields was a large shed formerly used for casting artillery. It was taken by Wesley in 1740 for a term of years and fitted up for preaching, and he resided in a small dwelling adjoining. On one occasion during Wesley's absence, his schoolmaster, Thomas Maxfield, preached a sermon in the foundry. At this Wesley was at first indignant, but after pondering the matter and consulting his friends, he finally decided not only to sanction but to organize and extend lay preaching; the Church's system however was not sufficiently flexible to allow of this design being carried out under her control; her chief pastors did not at that time meet in synod, and there was no attempt to ascertain the general opinion of the Church as to the nature of methodism and its use as an auxiliary. The order of preachers of the primitive Church, with special qualifications and without regard to parochial limits, no longer existed. John Wesley, therefore, proceeded to form a new preaching order. The details were arranged as each necessity arose, and between 1739 and 1744 methodism sprang up into a vigorous system. But in founding and managing the societies

Wesley adhered to the doctrine, and, as far as was possible, to the discipline, of the Anglican Church.

By sending out lay preachers without the sanction of the prelates Wesley committed an irregularity as a member of the Church of England, but in his replies to the many inquiries made by those who did not understand the nature of methodism, he stated that he and his lay preachers were "special messengers," who hoped to arouse the clergy to faithful performance of their duty—that the state of England was critical—and that the Church had fallen asleep. For a few years the work of the brothers was occasionally attended with personal risk; mobs collected, and on one occasion a lay preacher barely escaped with his life, and such riotous behaviour was not always checked by those who had the power to do so.

In June, 1744, the Wesleys held their first annual meeting or conference. For several days they and the few other clergy who had joined them held deliberation, and all worldly business being excluded, this meeting had much which resembled what is now known in our Church as a retreat. They proceeded to divide England into "circuits," and one or more of the lay preachers was appointed to labour for a given time in each. Preaching houses were established and the methodist body was organized under the name of the "united society." Wesley accepted the invitation of all clergy who asked him to assist them; and his position as the leader of the societies, together with their increasing number, led to his taking journeys of inspection, in the course of which he strictly attended church on the Sunday forenoon, while in the early morning, or in the latter part of the day, he preached wherever he could find a convenient place, or in any open spot that was suitable. The itinerant system with the circuit arrangement continues at the present day.

That Wesley never wished his movement to lead to a separation from the Church, and that he frequently through life, but especially in his later years, warned his followers against separation, is so well proved, that it is scarcely necessary to enlarge upon the fact. He would not let the methodists hold their meetings during the hours of church service, and required the society to attend church and to receive the Holy Communion there, and urged them to do so even if they did not esteem their minister. Wesley's lay preachers and open air services might indeed have been a valuable supplementary agency in the then state of the Church; but when we blame the prelates of that day for not accepting the founder of this system as a helpful auxiliary, we must bear in mind that the meetings of convocation had been suspended, and there was no regular opportunity for a bishop to state his views, and elicit the opinion of his brethren on such a matter as the desirability of sanctioning the mission of the Wesleys. The state in encroaching on the liberty of the Church by this suspension of convocation had prevented her from deliberating on such important subjects.

In 1747 Wesley first visited Ireland. He was courteously received by the archbishop and by many of the Dublin clergy, who,

however, seem to have disapproved of the two novelties which had startled English churchmen—the lay preaching and open air sermons. Wesley often revisited Ireland and seems to have been gratified when there. The Irish Church appears to have made a favourable impression upon him, but he looked upon the “penal laws” as worse than useless, and seems to have discovered that religion in Ireland is a matter of race, the natives or Celts being generally Roman catholics, and the colonists and descendants of colonists being protestants.

John Wesley’s famous sermon on the priestly office appears to have been repeatedly delivered before the assembled lay preachers, and such being the case, its application to those ambitious spirits was clear. The brothers had often been obliged to warn the preachers against impatience at their subordinate position and limited powers. They appear to have become personally anxious for higher rank, and promotion to the full ministerial office, and some protested against the precedence which was always given to clergymen who were willing to officiate. Wesley repressed this spirit, and it was with the view of reminding the preachers of the position which they occupied that he delivered this discourse. In it he pointed out that as under the Mosaic law there had been prophets and teachers who were not qualified to serve at the altar, so in the Christian Church there had been and still were in many countries those who occupied an important but a subordinate position. Any one who assumed the priestly office without being in the priestly line of descent was guilty of the crime of Koran, Dathan, and Abiram. From the beginning of methodism the call to preach had never implied any right to administer the sacraments. This was the glory of methodism, and if adhered to, would prevent any separation from the Church, whose doctrines, liturgy, and discipline the preacher warmly approved. Wesley implored the lay preachers to disregard temptation, to abide by their commission, which was not to administer the sacraments but to preach the gospel, and neither to encroach upon or to separate from the Church of England.

At the annual conference at Leeds in 1755, the subject of an existence independent of the Church was discussed, when it was agreed that it was not expedient, and in the following year the conference closed with a “solemn declaration of our purpose never to separate from the Church.” (*Journal*, September 26 and 28, 1756.)¹ But there was forming amongst the lay preachers a party who were anxious for the change, and the brothers frequently discussed this source of trouble and were perfectly agreed that the “ambition of the lay preachers must be repressed.” Charles Wesley, who was the stricter churchman of the two, would indeed have made undoubted attachment to the Church an indispensable condition of admission to the order, but this was thought too stringent a rule.

¹ See *Wesley's Place in Church History*, p. 100.

At the accession of George III. in 1760, methodism had become a power in England. The throne was now more worthily filled. The new king prided himself on being an Englishman by birth and an English churchman. This excellent prince was the first sovereign of the house of Hanover who gained the affections of his people. His court was a contrast to that of the two first Georges, as it afforded no encouragement to the scepticism and immorality which had so generally prevailed. It was his wish that every child in his dominions should be able to read the Bible.

At the commencement of his reign, doctor Secker, archbishop of Canterbury, made an attempt to send bishops to the British possessions in America, which had hitherto been left without episcopal supervision; but although the colonists desired it and had made their wishes known, the plan was defeated by an irreligious opposition at home. In 1771 some of those clergy who were inclined towards Socinianism, which opinions had met with much encouragement in the two previous reigns, drew up a petition to parliament, praying that the laws concerning subscription to the prayer book and the thirty-nine articles might be repealed. The petition was, however, much less numerously signed than was expected, and the house of commons rejected the proposal by a very large majority. The more honest of these petitioners eventually gave up their preferments and joined the ranks of those whose opinions they shared.

In 1778 a bill was passed mitigating the severity of the laws against Romanists, and in the following year dissenting ministers were relieved from the necessity of subscribing to the thirty-nine articles.

Methodism was steadily advancing, and was attracting the attention of the higher classes. The lay preachers were all under the personal direction of John Wesley, assisted by his brother and about twenty of the clergy. Some division in the methodist party occurred, as a controversy arose between the Wesleys and George Whitfield, the latter of whom took the Calvinian view of the subject of predestination and election. It was carried on with some bitterness, and the contention was so warm that it caused a separation, though ere the close of their lives they were on friendly terms, and the elder Wesley preached his old friend's funeral sermon.

As years passed on, Wesley saw that, unless he obtained a much larger amount of co-operation from his clerical brethren, his cherished wish of the full and complete union of his system with that of the Church would not be realized. As a rule the clergy were not unfriendly, but they declined the responsibility of taking part in a movement which their diocesans had not sanctioned, and whose future relations with the Church were daily becoming more uncertain. Wesley had little idea, when he established his societies and commenced field preaching, that the system would extend so widely, and he was earnest in his desire to work with and not against his Church. In a letter to Sir H. Trelawny, he says, "Having had opportunities of seeing several churches abroad, and

having deeply considered the several sorts of dissenters at home, I am fully convinced that our own Church with all her blemishes is nearer the scriptural plan than any other in Europe." This was written at the close of Wesley's life.¹

Having shown this excellent man's attachment to his Church and to primitive usages, we have now to mention wherein he departed from the Church's order. Methodism had taken root in America, and its value was very great in such a vast and thinly populated continent where regularly ordained ministers were so scarce. There was no proper organization of the Church; there were scattered congregations but no bishops. Pressing letters had been sent to Wesley on the necessity for more pastors; and as the case was urgent, and he was unable to procure ordination for a missionary from the bishop of London, he resolved to act on his own responsibility and appoint and ordain a few missionaries for America. To doctor Coke, who was in priest's orders in our Church, he gave a commission jointly with Francis Asbury to superintend the societies and the preachers in America. This took place in 1784. Dr. Coke's mission was temporary, but Asbury remained, and assumed the title of bishop much to the annoyance of Wesley. This title was afterwards assumed by others of the methodist connexion in the United States and is still retained by their chief ministers. If the pressing want of clergy in America was some excuse for Wesley's ordinations for that country, there was none for such conduct in regard to Scotland, where, if he did not acknowledge the claims of the established kirk, he was well aware that a true branch of the Anglican communion had long existed. But this step being once taken, it was no doubt more difficult to refuse the wishes of his lay preachers in another case, and so he ordained three of them for Scotland. He seems, however, to have acted in this against his own convictions, for the excusing circumstances of America were wanting, and it is recorded in his journal that he "yielded to the judgment of others."

Wesley was over eighty years of age when he performed this act, and though still in the full possession of his mental powers, which he retained to the end of his life, he was doubtless less resolute and more likely to be overborne by the wearying solicitations of others. The proceeding was contrary to the whole tenor of his life, and was an act too well calculated to hasten that separation from the Church which he had so strongly deprecated. In 1793, two years after his death, a letter was addressed to the conference by the trustees of the principal chapels in London and Bristol, in which was the following paragraph:—"Although Mr. Wesley by dint of importunity towards the close of his life, was prevailed upon to ordain a few of his preachers for America and Scotland, he by no means intended to extend or make it general."² The act, however, helped on what he and his brother so much wished to avoid; the

¹ See *Wesley's Place in Church History*, p. 52.

² See *Wesley's Place in Church History*, p. 162.

way for a separation had been prepared, and severance from the mother Church was the result.

There were many features of Wesley's revival which foreshadowed those of the Oxford church revival of the present century; such were weekly communion; frequent early week day services; the observance of the fasts and festivals of the Church; the commemoration of the faithful dead on All Saints' day, and the catechizing of the children in church after evening prayer. He anticipated the wishes of those who in our own day call for shortened and more numerous services, for the revival of the permanent diaconate, and for the employment of earnest laymen as auxiliaries to the clergy. In his preaching houses and mission chapels the puritan innovation of pews was discarded; rich and poor sat together on simple benches—men on one side, women on the other. The singing was quick and enlivening—the sermons were shortened. The morning prayer and communion service were read at different times. Wesley strictly regarded days of fasting, including all Fridays throughout the year, though he did not impose this upon others. His preaching was eminently practical, his sermons were characterized by great simplicity and rarely touched on any subjects but those he regarded as of vital importance to his hearers; for he considered his vocation to be that of gathering outcasts and strangers into the fold of Christ. In his old age he was treated with much distinction by the bishops and clergy, and received more invitations to preach than he could accept; but unfortunately this increasing sympathy led to no practical results.

John Wesley's life was now drawing to a close; but ere he was taken to his rest, he again addressed his followers in the magazine which he conducted, and with its closing words we will conclude this sketch of the saintly man. He said, "I declare once more that I live and die a member of the Church of England, and that none who regard my judgment will ever separate from it." In less than twelve months after this last remonstrance, in March, 1791, at nearly 88 years of age, John Wesley was carried to the grave amidst the tears of thousands who crowded the little cemetery in the City-road.

The separation so much deprecated by the venerable Wesley took place, and the Church of England has to lament the loss of some of her best sons. If it must be acknowledged that the deadness of the Church in Wesley's earlier years prepared the way for this event, we should not on the other hand forget that from political or other causes the voice of the Church had been silenced in convocation, and that a cold formality and a withering scepticism were the characteristics of the reigns of the two first sovereigns of the house of Hanover.

Charles Wesley shared with his brother for some years the difficult duties of directing the methodist movement; but after his marriage with Miss Gwynne, of Garth, in Brecknockshire, the remainder of his life was spent either in London or Bristol. He

did not agree with his brother in all things; he considered that bishops alone should confer holy orders, and so the act of ordination by John Wesley was kept secret from Charles until after it had been performed. When he heard that Holy Communion had been administered by certain lay preachers, his grief and indignation were extreme. He would have dissolved the societies and ended the system. He hoped and prayed that methodism would merge in the Church, and that bishops would be found to ordain the lay preachers. Charles Wesley was a poet of no mean order, and his hymns are now found in all collections of sacred poetry and books of praise. He died in 1788 and was buried in Mary-le-bone churchyard.

The Rev. John Fletcher, vicar of Madeley, in Shropshire, was a most valuable assistant in the work of the Wesleys. This admirable man has been justly called the "saint of methodism," and John Wesley had so high an opinion of him as to have selected him as his successor in the superintendence of his work, but he died in 1785.¹

George Whitfield, whom we have mentioned as the college companion and friend of the Wesleys, was like them an ordained priest in the Church of England. He was the leader of that other division of the methodist revival, the members of which are now distinguished by the name of Calvinistic methodists. Whitfield's preaching made an extraordinary impression from the first. It was not so much the words or the doctrine as the manner of his delivery: his earnestness—his enthusiasm—the very tone of his voice carried conviction to the hearts of his hearers. Such eloquence had not been known in the pulpit during that generation of Englishmen, and whether his voice was heard in thundering denunciations or persuasive and musical softness, all hearers hung with rapt attention upon his words. He first officiated at the Tower of London, and afterwards had a curacy in Hampshire, which he left in order to join the Wesleys in their first mission to America. When he returned to England, he commenced open air preaching amongst the colliers at Kingswood, near Bristol; and from that time till his death he moved from place to place in this kingdom, as well as in Ireland and America, to which countries he paid several visits, preaching to all orders of men, who flocked to hear him wherever he appeared. In 1748 he became known to Selina, countess of Huntingdon, who made him one of her chaplains, and this connexion introducing him to the higher circles of society, he found hearers amongst persons of distinction of both sexes. George Whitfield died in America. He was in many respects very dissimilar to the Wesleys, but they were alike famous as missionaries and evangelists, and each in his own way did a great work in arousing and reforming their countrymen. John Wesley may be looked upon as the organiser, Charles Wesley as the poet, and

¹ For further accounts of the Wesleys and their revival see Mr. Denny Umlin's interesting volume, published by Messrs. Rivingtons.

George Whitfield as the preacher in this great revival. It is said of John Wesley by lord Macaulay, "His genius for government was not inferior to that of Richelieu."

Selina, countess of Huntingdon, is also distinguished in the religious history of this period. She was born in 1707 and died in 1791. Inclining most to Calvinistic doctrines she joined the followers of Whitfield rather than those of Wesley, and besides Whitfield she selected other methodist clergy for her chaplains. In the college which she founded at Cheshunt it was left to the choice of the students whether they would seek holy orders in the Church of England or join the ranks of dissent, but she finally seceded from the Church and founded a sect which is known as "the countess of Huntingdon's connexion." She built and endowed chapels, but the liturgy of the Church of England was used in them; the principal of these, which she frequently attended, was at Bath. At her death she left money in the hands of trustees for the management of the college and chapels, which then numbered sixty-four.

The work of revival in Wales, when death had removed Griffith Jones from his labours, was carried on by the Rev. Daniel Rowlands and other clergy. Of the life and character of Mr. Rowlands it is necessary to give a slight sketch. Born in 1713, in the parish of Llangeitho, Cardiganshire, of which his father was vicar, he was educated at the grammar school, Hereford, and began his ministerial work about 1738. Shortly afterwards Griffith Jones came to the adjoining parish of Llanddewi-brefi¹ to preach, and his sermon made so deep an impression on the mind of Rowlands that he formed an earnest desire to assist in the work of reformation which that eminent clergyman was carrying on. At that time the people who attended Church in the morning usually spent the rest of the day in amusements, at tennis, dancing, and interludes. Others went to no place of worship but passed their hours on the Lord's day in the more objectionable pursuits of cock-fighting and drunkenness. Griffith Jones's efforts to improve the morals of his countrymen were producing a good effect, and his earnest style of preaching was awakening many to a sense of religion.

Mr. Rowlands held the curacy of Llanddewi-brefi in addition to the church of Llangeitho and that of an adjoining parish. The plainness of his language caused many who disliked his sermons to absent themselves from his church, but he determined if they would not come to him that he would go to them. There was a spot on one of the hills near Llangeitho where the giddy and dissolute assembled on Sunday to amuse themselves with the games and sports then practised. Thither Rowlands went and proclaimed the truths of the gospel with such faithfulness and zeal that those assemblages were given up. His success on these occasions was so very remarkable that it led to his adoption of open air preaching,

¹ Our readers will remember that this place is connected with St. David and bears his name.

and he was in the habit of travelling through the country on week days for that purpose. He and other clergy who adopted the same plan of itinerating from place to place occasionally met with great hostility and ill-treatment; the people being sometimes encouraged to those acts by their superiors. This opposition was less violent in South than in North Wales, which shows that Griffith Jones's circulating schools and catechizing classes had produced good effects in the South. Mr. Rowlands's preaching powers were very remarkable, so that he not only overcame opposition but influenced his hearers in an extraordinary manner, and his anxiety to enlarge this influence led him to extend his open air preaching, in which he did not confine his ministrations to his own parishes. But his proceedings were more irregular than those of Mr. Griffith Jones, who worked with the Church, whereas Mr. Rowlands after a time preached in meeting-houses or chapels of the methodists which were now being built. Many other Welsh clergy did the same occasionally, and it would appear that some went so far as to administer the Lord's supper in the meeting-houses. This deviation from the rule of the Church was naturally disapproved by their diocesans, who required them to adhere more strictly to the Church's system.

The then bishop of St. David's advised Mr. Rowlands to desist from these irregularities, but he excused himself from so doing as he considered the circumstances of the country required it. Eventually, it was decided to deprive him of his curacies, which was done about the year 1763. This circumstance, considering the irreligious state of the country, is to be regretted, as his preaching was so well calculated to awaken the careless and profane.

A large chapel was soon built for Mr. Rowlands at Llangeitho, where he resided. The more excitable temperament of the Welsh seems to have led to practices amongst the methodists which were not carried on in England, but Rowlands does not appear to have encouraged the habit of "jumping" while praising God; though it is said that it was his energetic and impassioned style of preaching which led to those extraordinary demonstrations of religious excitement which caused the nickname of "jumpers" to be given to the Welsh methodists at this time. He administered Holy Communion monthly, and on these Sundays more than a thousand people used to assemble, who had travelled together over the hills on the previous day in parties of twenty or thirty, some on foot, some on horseback, reaching Llangeitho on Saturday night, and after hearing sermons from this eloquent preacher they returned to their distant homes, some of them having come even from Bala, in North Wales, a distance of sixty miles. Mr. Rowlands died in 1790, and his memory is greatly cherished by the Calvinistic methodists of the principality.

This good man, like Wesley, did not wish his people to separate from the established Church, as he expected that the time would come when the evils which then existed in Wales would disappear, and the necessity for the irregularities to which he and other

of the clergy felt compelled to resort would cease. He charged his son not to leave the Church of England, and said that he was convinced that God would revive her and make her prosperous.¹ Whatever our religious opinions may be, it is impossible not to respect and admire a man who was so sincere in his convictions and so earnest in carrying them out.

Before closing our account of this religious revival in the principality, mention must be made of the Rev. T. Charles, of Bala, in North Wales. He was a native of Carmarthenshire, born in 1755, and educated at Llanddowror; also at the grammar school of Carmarthen, and afterwards, through the assistance of friends, he became a graduate of Jesus college, Oxford, and was ordained at that university in 1778. He appears to have been unhappily placed in his first curacies, in one of which offence was taken at his style of preaching. It is possible that being young he was deficient in tact and judgment. Being afterwards desirous to obtain a curacy near Bala, and unable to procure it, yet unwilling to be idle, he invited the young people of that town, where he had gone to reside, to come to his house for religious instruction on Sunday evenings. The house soon became too small to accommodate them, and he was offered one of the Calvinistic methodist chapels, which he accepted. This was the commencement of Sunday schools in Wales, and immense good has been effected by them. Charles followed Mr. Griffith Jones's plan with regard to circulating schools, for the ignorance in North Wales was very great, scarcely one person in twenty being able to read the Scriptures. At this time Mr. Jones's schools were suffering from the effects of the chancery suit which followed the death of Mrs. Bevan. In 1789 the Sunday schools began to be carried out systematically, and one peculiarity of them was the attendance of adults. They increased very rapidly, and some years later associations of the different schools were held, when they met in some central place and were publicly catechized. Mr. Charles speaks of the quickness of intellect and strength of memory shown by the children, a fact which is still noticed by all who have taken an interest in the education of the Welsh poor. In those days instruction in the Bible was the leading feature in both day and Sunday schools; no system of education which excluded the Holy Scriptures would have been thought complete in Wales.

In 1784 Mr. Charles finally decided to join the methodists, and continued to be an itinerant preacher during the remainder of his life; but the methodists were then and long afterwards in communion with the established Church. His view of this step is shown in letters to a clerical friend when in somewhat similar circumstances:—"As you are already in the Church I think rather you ought to continue in it. When I began to itinerate, it was because they would not employ me in the Church in this county.

¹ See *Memoir of Rev. Daniel Rowlands*, by Rev. John Owen. Also *Memoir of Rev. T. Charles, of Bala*, by Rev. Ed. Morgan, pp. 161, 226.

I got so far into the work that I could not conscientiously leave it. . . . I might have had preferment in the Church; it has been repeatedly offered me." From this we may gather that the coldness with which his earlier efforts were met was not continued by the church authorities in later years. Such coldness was both impolitic and unjust, but happily zeal and diligence are now encouraged as well as practised by the heads of our Church in Wales.

Welsh Bibles were much wanted at this time, especially in North Wales. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge published in 1799 an edition of five thousand copies, and they were immediately disposed of. Mr. Charles took part in the formation of the British and Foreign Bible Society,¹ which work was also aided by the Rev. Thomas Jones, vicar of Creaton, Northamptonshire. This worthy clergyman was educated at the grammar school of Ystrad Meurig, in Cardiganshire, and was ordained in 1774 to a curacy near Aberystwyth. He was appointed to the curacy of Creaton in 1785, and shortly afterwards established a Sunday school in the parish. When he revisited his native country he was deeply impressed with the want of Bibles in the Welsh language, and this led him to assist in the project of founding a society for the express purpose of printing the Scriptures in his own and various other languages. Mr. Jones published numerous religious works in English and in Welsh, some being translations and others original productions of his pen. He succeeded to the vicarage of Creaton, and died 1845.

¹ See *History of the Life and Labours of the Rev. T. Charles, of Bala*, by Rev. Ed. Morgan.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

CENTURIES XVIII. AND XIX.

THE AMERICAN EPISCOPATE. REVIVAL OF ACTIVITY IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. CHARLES OF BALA AND THE METHODISTS. RENEWED ACTIVITY OF THE CHURCH IN WALES. IRELAND. THE COLONIAL CHURCH. MISSIONARY BISHOPS. THE AMERICAN EPISCOPAL CHURCH. CONCLUSION.

THE peace which was concluded between England and her American colonies in 1783, secured the independence of the latter. The Church had suffered greatly in the United States, but the same stroke which severed these colonies from the mother country set the American branch of our Church free to obtain that gift of the episcopate which had hitherto been denied to her. It had been proposed in the time of Charles II. to send a bishop to Virginia. In the reign of queen Anne preparations were made for founding four bishoprics for the States, and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel had raised funds for the purpose; but the queen's death put an end to these hopes; and as no extension of the Church could be looked for during the reign of the first two Georges, and obstacles existed or were supposed to exist during the first part of the reign of George III., it came to pass that the first year of American independence became also the first year of the episcopate. The clergy of the province of Connecticut met as soon as peace was concluded, and elected doctor Samuel Seabury, a missionary of the S.P.G., for their bishop, sending him to England for consecration. The archbishop of Canterbury and the other English prelates, though most willing to grant this request, were at that time unable to do so, as the government, not feeling sure of the general wish of the American people, feared that fresh disagreements might arise should the consecration required be bestowed by the English episcopate. But doctor Seabury was advised to apply to the bishops of the Scottish episcopal Church, who, having no connection with the state, were able to act without any risk of disturbing the new-made peace. The Scottish prelates, after consulting the archbishop of Canterbury, proceeded in the matter, and in November, 1784, doctor Seabury was consecrated by three Scottish bishops and returned to his native land, being the first prelate consecrated for the American commonwealth. Of the progress of this great branch of the Anglican communion we shall presently speak: this event is now only alluded to, as a more detailed account will be given in a future page.

Doctor Porteous, bishop of Chester, afterwards bishop of London, had been favourably disposed towards Wesley's labours, and he used his influence in aiding the attempt to organize a revival within the Church. In this good work he was assisted by several members

of the laity, amongst the most prominent of whom were William Wilberforce, whose name will ever be associated with the great work of the suppression of the slave trade, and Mrs. Hannah More, the well-known authoress. This, which is known as the evangelical movement, may be considered as a consequence of the methodist revival, but resulting rather more from the work of Whitfield than that of Wesley, as some of its most energetic supporters had been identified with him in his association with lady Huntingdon. When this lady seceded from the Church, many of the clergy and laity still kept up a friendly intercourse with her and her associates, though they withdrew from any formal connection with her new society. Lady Huntingdon's college furnished many students who received holy orders.

The way was thus prepared; but the movement received a great impetus from the publication of a book written by Mr. Wilberforce, called *A Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System of Professed Christians in the Higher and Middle Classes of this Country, contrasted with Real Christianity*. Being written by a layman and a well-known member of parliament, it made its way in circles which might not have been open to clerical influence, and it showed that there could be real earnest religion without exaggerated excitement. The book met with an extraordinary sale; in a few days it was out of print, and in six months thirty-seven thousand five hundred copies were sold. The results were striking. Personal religion revived in quarters where infidelity and immorality had formerly prevailed, and to which the influence of methodism had not extended. Churches were built, the poor were taught and cared for, and preaching from the lips of such men as Cecil, Simeon, and Venn became a powerful instrument in awakening the consciences of their hearers.¹

The high church party of that day, taken as a class, were worldly minded; their preaching was that of a cold morality, and they did not maintain the sanctity of the ministerial character, though they were generally men of pure lives. Under their management the Church remained in a state of lethargy. Too many of the clergy were non-resident, and some of the bishops rarely visited their dioceses. Yet the high church leaders possessed great qualities and were deeply learned, and during the latter half of the seventeenth century they headed the scholarship of England and many branches of its literature. The French revolution of 1789 introduced a new style of infidelity, which was well answered in argument by such men as Watson and Paley; but the clergy did not follow up their advantage. The very men whom they had converted by argument from infidel opinions needed activity and zeal to ensure a lasting result to that conversion. To convince the intellect was insufficient without warming the heart. Such were high churchmen of that time; the "high and dry school," as it

¹ Blunt's *Key to Church History*, p. 128.

has been called, at the period when the evangelical movement infused fresh warmth and earnestness into the English Church.

Charles Simeon, who was the incumbent of Trinity church, Cambridge, was the life of the movement. Through his influence evangelical principles became widely spread in that university, especially amongst those who were preparing for holy orders, and when ordained they carried this influence with them to their different parishes. The distinguishing feature of their theology was "justification by faith alone;" a doctrine which had been lost sight of in the moral essays of the pulpits of that time. But in their anxiety to implant this almost forgotten truth, they dwelt on it to the exclusion of those means of grace by which faith is strengthened and the religious life sustained. From a praiseworthy desire to be on charitable and friendly terms with those who had seceded, the clergy of the evangelical school were apt to keep distinctive doctrines in the back ground; and thus their followers were unable to give a reason why membership with the Church should be adhered to. Schism and religious divisions were lightly regarded; and whilst some truths were brought plainly and strongly forward, others of equal importance and interest were overlooked. The services were too frequently performed in a slovenly manner, and the sacraments did not hold a due place in their system. The good, however, which resulted from the influence of these leaders of the evangelical school, was very great, and it was followed up by their immediate successors, such as the Sumners, the Bickersteths, Daniel Wilson, and others. A great reformation ensued. The laity were roused; the outward forms of religion were no longer neglected even by the inconsiderate and thoughtless; and this great revival of life within our Church must ever make the latter half of the eighteenth century a memorable epoch in her history.

In 1804 the British and Foreign Bible Society was founded by members of the Church, with the view of working in union with dissenters in printing and circulating the Holy Scriptures. This work had been and still is carried on within the Church, by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. The Bible Society has since its foundation distributed many millions of Bibles and Testaments, not only throughout Great Britain and her colonies, but in every part of the world.

The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel had been working for a hundred years when the other great missionary society of the Church began its career. Amongst its founders were John Venn and John Newton. The duty it proposed to itself was the evangelization of the heathen. The difference in the system of the two societies was, that the S.P.G. worked in our colonies, raising the banner of the cross every where in our own dominions, and from thence extending outwards to the heathen, while the Church Missionary Society sent forth its missionaries at once to heathen lands and placed them amongst the natives. The first agents despatched by the C.M.S. were two Germans, who went out in 1804 as missionaries to West Africa—that coast so fatal to Europeans. They

fell victims to the deadly climate almost as soon as they arrived; but when these brave soldiers of the cross fell, others equally heroic stepped into their places only to be in their turn swept down by the fatal fever of that land. There is perhaps no finer record of self-devotion in all the annals of the Church of England.

The rules of this society require its missionaries to be licensed and superintended abroad by colonial or missionary bishops where such are to be found. Its work has largely prospered in Africa, New Zealand, and India. A proposal to increase the Indian episcopate was for some time opposed by the society, but that much needed measure has lately been carried out. Several of the native and European missionaries who are in connection with the society are labouring in our Indian possessions, and Christianity has of late made great progress in Tinnevely. The history of the first native who was raised to the episcopal office (we allude to bishop Crowther) is very touching. A native of Africa, he was sold as a slave about 1821, together with his mother and sisters, and eventually became the property of a Portuguese slave dealer at Lagos. The ship which bore him away, intending to land him with the rest of the miserable cargo at Cuba or Brazil, was captured by H.M.S. *Myrmidon*, and the liberated Africans were landed at the British settlement of Sierra Leone. It was in 1808 that this place had been employed as a depôt for rescued slaves, and in 1816 the C.M.S. undertook the task of educating and Christianizing these children of Africa. The rescued slave boy was eager to learn, and with him was a little girl who had been carried captive from the same tribe. In December, 1825, the youth was baptized, taking the name of Samuel Crowther, and the following year he paid his first visit to England. Three years later Samuel was married to the young companion of his captivity, who was now a baptized Christian, named Susanna. After doing good work as schoolmaster and teacher, Samuel Crowther again came to England, and was ordained in 1843, by the bishop of London, just twenty-one years after he had been rescued from slavery and received under the protection of the British flag. Soon after his return to Africa he providentially met with his mother and sisters; and after having for many years given good proof of his zeal and faithfulness as a missionary amongst his countrymen, he was in 1864 consecrated bishop of the Niger territory, where he had founded a mission in 1857; and in that region bishop Crowther, with his sons and sons-in-law, is working with untiring devotion in the cause of Christianity.¹

The beneficial effect of well conducted missions has been eloquently set forth by many of our Indian commanders and statesmen—lord Napier, lord Lawrence, Sir Bartle Frere, and others; and the prejudice which once existed against missionary efforts has died away under the more enlightened humanity of the present day. The intercourse of the white man with the native races too often

¹ See the *Church Missionary Gleaner* for 1869, published by Seeley and Co.

teaches the latter the vices of civilization; how great then is our responsibility if we withhold from them the knowledge of religion.

“ Shall we whose souls are lighted
With wisdom from on high,
Shall we to man benighted
The light of life deny ? ”

BISHOP HEBER.

The work of education had so increased in the hands of the S.P.C.K. that it was found necessary in 1811 to place this division of its labours under the superintendence and direction of a distinct society, whose sole object should be that of the education of the poor. A committee of its members, headed by the bishop of London, drew up rules for the management of the new society, which has long been well known as the ‘ National Society for the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church in England and Wales.’ In 1817 it was incorporated by royal charter, and from that time to the present day it has assisted largely in the building of schools and training colleges; so that there are few parishes in England and Wales which it has not helped with money or school materials. Its depository supplies the clergy and school managers with books, maps, and all kinds of appliances required in elementary schools. The education of the poor, not only in religious principles, but in secular knowledge, is a great work for which our Church may justly claim the gratitude of the nation; for many thousands without her aid would have been untaught. When the movement was started by the S.P.C.K., and long afterwards, the schools were called charity schools, and the scholars charity children. The Bible teaches us that charity means love; and the term as then used meant the well-loved children of the Church. It is unnecessary for the purposes of this work to mention the many other existing church societies, and we will only add that the S.P.C.K., and its daughters the S.P.G. and the National Society, all sprang from the movement of the five churchmen in 1699, and are the oldest societies established in our islands for Christian purposes.

Until the commencement of this century the Welsh methodists had been considered as part of the established Church. None but ministers who had received episcopal ordination administered the Holy Communion, and the children were baptized by the clergyman of their parish. But many amongst them wished for a different state of things, and desired that the lay preachers in Wales should receive the same ordination which had been bestowed upon those in England. Such of the clergy as laboured among the methodists strongly resisted the proposal; but at length, at an association of the methodists at Bala in 1810, Mr. Charles, who had hitherto opposed their desire, made a public declaration of his consent to it. The following year eight of the preachers were set apart for the ministerial office, and thus the separation from the Church, which was deprecated by many of their friends, was completed. Mr.

Charles's conduct in sanctioning this change in the methodist connexion was displeasing to the numerous body of clergy who had hitherto co-operated with them.

The secession of the methodists caused the loss to the Church in Wales of a large and earnest religious body, and the revival of life and energy within her communion was extremely slow. Only one Sunday service was usually given in the country parishes; and in some cases the clergyman, having another church to serve, hurried over the first duty to proceed to the second. Many of the churches had been built without regard to ecclesiastical architecture, and were fitted inside with rickety benches for the poor, and high pews for the richer classes of hearers—"sleeping boxes" as they were called—in some of which were fire-places, and the energetic stirring of the fire by the occupants occasionally drowned the voice of the preacher! Many of the clergy employed their time in farming, and the miserable stipend given to the curates obliged them to occupy themselves in the same manner, as the only secular calling which was open to them. Parochial visiting was therefore very little practised. There were few day schools; for the laity were not aroused to their duty of providing for the education of the poor. Sometimes an adventure school was opened by a broken down tradesman.

In South Wales Mrs. Bevan's circulating schools were a blessing to the localities in which they moved, as by their means many children learned the rudiments of education. The grammar schools in the country towns were the only means of instruction afforded to the majority of candidates for holy orders, and many were unable to reap the full benefit of these in consequence of the comparatively short period which they could afford to give to education. They were thus not only deficient in learning, but in manners and address, and were unable to exert that influence over the upper classes which was possessed by the clergy in England. The absence of such influence was very prejudicial to the laity, who lost sight of their religious duties, neglected the interests of their Church, and forgot the respect due to the sacred office of the ministry. There were of course exceptions to this state of affairs; but we speak of what were the general habits of both clergy and laity at that time. We do not forget the labours of the Rev. D. Jones, of Llangan, and the Rev. D. Griffiths, of Nevern, in Pembrokeshire, both of whom were contemporaries of Mr. Charles, of Bala, and their names are still held in veneration by the Church in Wales.

The farmers and working classes, whose parents and grandparents had been roused to a sense of religious duty by such men as Rowlands, Charles, and others, left the Church when they found no revival within her pale. Dissent consequently increased and spread, and dissenting chapels multiplied. The Sunday schools which had been mainly established by Mr. Charles, of Bala, exercised a powerful hold over the people. There they acquired a knowledge of the Bible which was very remarkable; for it must be again observed that instruction in the Holy Scriptures was *never*

neglected by the Welsh dissenters of those days, and at that time no day school would have been thought worthy of attendance from which the Bible was excluded. But though the people left her fold, there was no antagonistic feeling shown towards the mother Church, especially amongst the Calvinistic and Wesleyan methodists. The latter have always been a small body in Wales. The independents, or congregationalists, came into the principality at the time of the Commonwealth or previously, and they from their origin never indulged in the same friendly feeling towards the Church. The baptists of course differed on a point of doctrine, but absolute hostility was not then displayed by either of these communities.

It may not be out of place to say a few words respecting the baptist communion in the principality. It appears that a baptist chapel was founded in Carmarthen in 1660, and in Brecknockshire about 1699. One of the most popular baptist ministers, named Christmas Evans, was born in 1766, near Llandyssul, Cardigan-shire. Of humble parentage, he possessed scarcely any advantages of education; but while in farm service he acquired the rudiments of learning and some religious impressions, and appears to have joined the independents. He met with a severe accident in some affray from no fault of his own, and soon afterwards adopted the tenets of the baptists, and was baptized into their society by immersion in 1788. He resided at different times in both North and South Wales, always attending the associations of the baptists, and attracting a large number of people by his preaching. His highly imaginative style and somewhat theatrical action rendered him uncommonly popular. Christmas Evans died at Swansea in 1838, having had the satisfaction of seeing during his long and active life a large increase in the baptist connexion in Wales, and leaving various tracts and hymns as memorials of his labours.¹

The good and learned bishop Burgess, when he was appointed to the diocese of St. David's, set himself to apply a remedy for some of the evils which existed in the Welsh Church by founding the college of St. David's, Lampeter, in 1827, where by following up the instruction given in the grammar schools, a good education at a reasonable cost might be provided for candidates for holy orders. In this good work the bishop was largely aided by the late J. S. Harford, esq., of Blaize castle, who was connected by the ties of property with the county of Cardigan. The bishop had the happiness of witnessing a gradual improvement—an improvement which increased and spread through the whole of the principality. One of the first perceptible changes was the more reverent performance of divine service. The laity showed that they were awakened to a sense of their duty by the establishment and support of day schools in connection with the Church, thus encouraging the clergy in their parochial work. The dissenters gladly and thankfully availed themselves of these schools as a means of giving their children a useful education; neither were religious difficulties heard

¹ See Williams's *Eminent Welshmen*, p. 148.

of, for the seeds of jealousy and discord had not then been sown. The schools rapidly increased, and after the turnpike disturbances of 1843 had brought Wales more prominently into notice, churchmen both in and out of the principality were still more liberal in their contributions, and the Welsh education fund was formed, the National Society coming nobly forward to assist. A training college for schoolmasters was founded at Carmarthen in 1847, and one in North Wales for female teachers soon afterwards. During the last fifty years the revival and improvement of the Church has been conspicuous. Clergy and laity became ashamed of their barn-like churches. Each year new schools and teachers' houses were erected, new churches and parsonages built, or old ones renovated; the services made brighter and more acceptable; the cathedrals restored; the musical talents of the people enlisted in church choirs and singing classes; while weekly offertories and Bible classes, together with lenten and advent services, became general.

One serious disadvantage continues to affect the Church in Wales—the large amount of tithes which are in lay hands. This has caused the livings in many places to be miserably poor, and has necessitated the union of parishes in order to give even a small stipend to the clergyman. Many of the lay impropiators reside in distant localities and take no thought of the poor vicarage which is impoverished by their possession of its income. When we add to this evil the great extent and scattered population of many of the parishes, it will be seen that the work of the Church in Wales is difficult and trying, while the necessity for being thoroughly acquainted with the Welsh language greatly restricts the choice of incumbents. The renewed life and activity of the Church is, notwithstanding these drawbacks, steadily progressing; and though beset with many difficulties and much opposition, she has thoroughly aroused herself to her work.

When we last mentioned the episcopal Church of Scotland, it was suffering severely from the effects of the penal laws, which were enacted after the Jacobite rising in 1745; and in alluding to the consecration of doctor Seabury for the Church in the United States of America, doctor Eden, bishop of Moray and Ross, says, "It took place, not in a cathedral, for they had none; not in a church, for the law then prohibited episcopalians in Scotland from worshipping in a church; but in an upper chamber (still existing) in Aberdeen. There the bishops of Aberdeen, of Moray, and of Ross met, and consecrated the first bishop of what is now the great and flourishing American Church."¹ At that very time the severe penal statutes were still in force against Scottish episcopalians, but under the most calamitous circumstances, says a recent writer, the Scottish bishops did not neglect the continuance of the episcopal succession and the regular government of their Church.²

¹ *The Church of Scotland*, a sermon preached by the bishop of Moray and Ross, May 3rd, 1876.

² Grub, vol. iv., p. 46.

The event just related recalled to the recollection of English churchmen that a Church having the same orders, liturgy, and government as their own still existed in Scotland; and as the penal laws greatly opposed her prosperity and influence, plans for their repeal began to be taken into consideration.

On the death of Charles Edward in 1788, all obstacles being removed to the acknowledgment of the house of Hanover, a synod was held at Aberdeen, and in the month of May king George III. was publicly prayed for in all the episcopal chapels. But it was not till 1792 that the friends of religious liberty, having used their utmost exertions to free their northern brethren from the persecuting statutes of 1746 and 1748, obtained a complete toleration for them on condition of their subscribing to the thirty-nine articles and taking the oath of allegiance. One disability, however, still remained, which was not consistent with the generous spirit of the British parliament; no clergyman of the Scottish episcopal communion could hold a benefice or curacy in England.

In 1817 a body of canons was drawn up by the bishops and clergy in a synod of the Church of Scotland, when it was enacted that the thirty-nine articles of the Anglican Church should be adopted, and that the English communion office should be used at the discretion of the clergy, provided that the Scottish communion office was read at the consecration of bishops and at the opening of synods. The remainder of the English prayer book had been in general use since the year 1765. In 1864 the last bar to entire union between the English and Scottish churches was taken away; the disabilities attaching to Scotch clergy in England were removed, and the Scottish episcopal orders recognized by the laws of parliament as well as by the Church of England. At the close of the eighteenth century the clergy which formerly numbered one thousand had decreased to less than fifty, and the bishops were reduced from fourteen to four. But during the present century the Scotch episcopal Church has steadily advanced, and now numbers under its seven bishops,¹ two hundred congregations, some of them the largest and most flourishing the country has to show, while churches and cathedrals have been built and schools and colleges established.² In 1841 it was resolved to establish a college for the training of candidates for holy orders in the episcopal Church, and for the purposes of general education. Collegiate buildings were subsequently erected in Glenalmond, near Perth, and the Rev. Charles Wordsworth was appointed warden.³ The college which flourished under his auspices continues to do so. In 1852 the warden became bishop of the ancient see of St. Andrews. A distinction which originated in the hard necessity of the times, between clergy of English and Irish orders officiating in Scotland, and those of the

¹ Namely, Moray, Aberdeen, Argyll, Edinburgh, Glasgow, St. Andrews, Brechin.

² *The Scottish Church in its relations to the Church of England*, by doctor Charles Wordsworth, bishop of St. Andrews.

³ Grub, vol. iv., p. 245.

Scottish episcopal communion, was happily terminated by the repeal of the penal laws. This union was assisted by the exertions of several English prelates who exposed the inconsistency of episcopal clergymen claiming to be independent of the native bishops.

Though historical truth has compelled us to show that presbyterianism in Scotland owed its rise to popular ignorance and political faction, it is due to that communion to give full credit to its evangelical energy, and to acknowledge the learning and liberality displayed by its clergy during later years. Presbyterians have long since learned, while asserting their own rights, to allow to others the liberty which they claim for themselves.

The slight sketch of ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland which has been given in these pages has, we trust, conveyed to our readers some idea of the origin of those religious differences which still exist in that portion of our island. There have been on both sides errors, sufferings, and struggles; but they have generally been described by historians with a strong leaning towards the presbyterians, and taken from sources which are not free from suspicion. Our time has not been lost if we have shown that the episcopal Church of Scotland is an independent Church, a true branch of the ancient catholic Church of these islands, possessing an undoubted apostolical succession, and we rejoice that she is, after all her trials and persecutions, gradually advancing in influence and pursuing her way in peace.¹

There is little to relate of the Church in Ireland. An ill feeling continued to exist during the eighteenth century between the Romanists and those of the reformed faith—between the native Irish and those who had come to settle in the country. A rebellion of some importance took place in 1798, of which lord Edward Fitzgerald was one of the leaders. After this the English government decided on passing an act of union, which was effected in 1801. By this act the civil and ecclesiastical government of the two countries were amalgamated. During the earlier years of the nineteenth century the influence of the Roman catholic clergy in Ireland gradually increased, and was greatly aided by a "Catholic Association" so called, which levied large sums of money throughout the country, its avowed object being to procure complete emancipation for Roman catholics from all civil disabilities. This association was suppressed by act of parliament in 1825, but the agitation continued. The Roman catholic emancipation bill was passed in 1829, with the hope of tranquilizing Ireland. In 1833 ten bishoprics of the Irish Church were suppressed; and in 1869 the Irish Church was disestablished by Mr. Gladstone's government and the liberal parliament of that date. The event is too recent to pronounce upon its probable results. Its professed object was the reconciliation of rival creeds and interests by the removal of any recognition by the state of what the Irish Romanists called

¹ See Russell, vol. ii., p. 406—412. Also Dr. Eden and Dr. Wordsworth, named before.

“protestant ascendancy.” In the meantime the Irish Church is exerting herself to meet the necessities of her position, and her archbishops, bishops, and clergy have united in synod with the laity of her communion, to arrange such measures as are rendered needful by the temporal and spiritual disadvantages to which she has been subjected.

Mr. Raikes, of Gloucester, is generally considered the founder of Sunday schools in England; though other persons preceded him in this good work. It appears that Mr. Lindsey, vicar of Catterick, in Yorkshire, in 1763, employed a portion of each Sunday in this mode of religious instruction, and the plan was also carried out by Miss Bell, a benevolent lady, at High Wycombe. The idea of Sunday instruction was suggested to Mr. Raikes by the Rev. T. Stock, a clergyman in Gloucester, and these two gentlemen established and supported Sunday schools there in 1780. Mr. Raikes observes, “In those parishes where this plan has been adopted the behaviour of the children is greatly improved. Those who cannot read are taught to do so, and those who can are taught the catechism and Scriptures, and taken to church.” Mr. Raikes survived for nearly thirty years to witness the good effect of his benevolent exertions and the increasing number of Sunday schools. Doctor Andrew Bell, a native of St. Andrews, was a promoter of many improvements in the system of teaching in our national schools. He took holy orders, and died in 1832, bequeathing £120,000 for the advancement of literature and education.

The name of Joseph Lancaster is well known as a benefactor to the same cause. A quaker, born in 1771, the son of a soldier in the foot guards, he exerted himself as far as his humble means would allow in the education of the poor; and his praiseworthy efforts attracting attention, he was honoured with an interview with George III., who on that occasion uttered the memorable sentence respecting the education of his poorer subjects which we have already mentioned.¹ The British and Foreign School Society owed its origin to Joseph Lancaster, the Bible being the basis of instruction.

We have spoken of the services rendered to religion by the evangelical movement in our Church; but when, after that revival the study of theology also revived, many thoughtful men, some of whom had been brought up in the evangelical school, felt that something more was required to develope Christian life within the Church, as well as to extend its influence over those beyond her fold. They saw that the system had been too one-sided in its operations, and this became more apparent as those excellent men who had guided its course departed to their rest.

In 1833 a conference was held at Hadleigh, in Suffolk, at the house of the Rev. Hugh James Rose, and a new and important epoch is to be dated from that event. This movement, of which Oxford became the cradle, as Cambridge had been that of its pre-

¹ See page 454.

decessor, is commonly known as the tractarian movement, obtaining this name from the *Tracts for the Times*, which first appeared in 1833. These tracts continued to be published till 1841, when the author of the celebrated Tract 90 was censured by the university authorities, and the publication was brought to a close. During the earlier years of this movement we have to lament the departure from our Church of some, who, as Wesley at one time said of himself, "drew the bow too far." These, not having the firmness to know when and where to stop, joined the Romish communion, hoping to find rest and peace in a Church which claims to be infallible. These secessions gave rise to considerable uneasiness in the minds of many; but the tracts themselves, together with the sermons of Newman, and the poetry and prose writings of Keble and Isaac Williams,¹ attracted an immense amount of interest and attention, which spread throughout the kingdom amongst clergy and laity. Long-forgotten truths had been brought prominently forward, the proper accompaniments of those other truths which had been dwelt on, though too exclusively, by the evangelicals. Such were the nature of the Church, the necessity and value of more frequent communion, multiplication of services, more reverent celebration of divine worship, the value of the writings of the early fathers of the Christian Church, greater attention to the sacrament of baptism, and to the catholic and apostolic teaching of the Anglican communion, and more exactness in following its rule and order. This revival spread rapidly, and a higher tone became generally prevalent, not only in the externals of church architecture and music, but in theological learning, in strictness of living amongst the clergy, and in a greater spirit of zeal and devotion amongst the laity.

The following tribute to the work done by this section of our Church was lately paid by a well-known and excellent evangelical clergyman, canon Miller, of Greenwich:—"To our high church brethren it becomes us to do full justice. Has the high church section of our clergy and laity, the great majority that is of our clergy and no inconsiderable number of the laity, advanced since 1827 in spiritual life? Surely there is not one among us, there breathes not an evangelical, so blinded by the narrowness and bigotry of party as not to give thankfully and unhesitatingly an affirmative answer. Look at their lives. It is not only that the

¹ The late Rev. Isaac Williams, fellow and tutor of Trinity college, Oxford, son of the late J. Ll. Williams, esq., of Cwmcynfelin, near Aberystwyth, was a contemporary at the university, and a friend through life, of men who have made their mark in the world. He died in 1865, and was distinguished as an author both in prose and in verse. In the exquisite poems in his *Baptistery*, entitled "The death of the Righteous" and "The Pilgrims of St. David's," Mr. Williams combines fine descriptions of the wild and varied beauty of his native land with that deeply religious thought and feeling by which his works are distinguished. Those who are acquainted with the fine bold coast of Cardigan bay can recognize its beauties in his "Creation," and appreciate his description of "rocks loved from childhood, on some wild sea shore;" while he teaches his readers to look "through nature up to nature's God."

general standard of clerical propriety, consistency, and morality is higher, but many of them are examples of saintly lives before our eyes and in their homes."¹

The chief external events connected with the Church in this century were the repeal of the test and corporation acts in 1828, and the passing of the Roman catholic emancipation bill in 1829. The act of emancipation enabled Romanists to sit in parliament. In 1840 the government of the day brought in an education bill; but such was the opposition offered by a certain party amongst the dissenters, on account of the influence which they alleged it would give to the Church, that the measure was withdrawn. This failure, however, gave an immense impetus to the efforts of churchmen with respect to education, and very large sums were subscribed by them for the building and maintenance of schools. In 1846 the state came forward to assist national and other voluntary schools with grants towards buildings, books, salaries of pupil teachers, and capitation allowances. This was much opposed, on the broad principle of objecting to all assistance from the state, by the same party which had opposed the education bill; but they subsequently considered it advisable to change this opinion and avail themselves of government aid to their schools.

By the ecclesiastical commission which was incorporated by act of parliament in 1836, the division and subdivision of large and overgrown parishes has been carried out; and this has produced very beneficial results, especially in towns where the population had outgrown the supervision of the clergyman and his power to minister to them. In cases where a sufficient endowment is assured, these districts are made into separate parishes. The ecclesiastical commissioners also meet donations given to increase the income of small livings, by grants from the funds at their disposal.

The Roman catholic communion in England had been placed under the care of vicars apostolic in 1623, and this arrangement continued till the year 1850, when pope Pius IX. formally appointed an archbishop of Westminster, and twelve bishops, deriving their titles from their own sees, thus mapping out the kingdom into twelve dioceses. This intrusion into sees already provided with prelates caused great excitement at the time, but though Romanism has redoubled its exertions and increased its machinery during the last thirty years, it has not made any great progress in this country.

In 1868 compulsory church rates were abolished. This rate, as we showed in an early portion of this work, was a tax upon the land to which every tenant knew that his holding was subject. The plea set forth by dissenters for its abolition was the hardship of contributing to the maintenance of churches and churchyards, whilst paying for the expenses attendant on their own form of worship.

In 1870 the present education act was passed. Hitherto the

¹ *The condition of the Church of England in 1827 and 1877.* An address by Rev. canon Miller, D.D., at the jubilee of the "Islington Clerical Meeting."

education of the people in England and Wales had been carried on almost entirely by the voluntary efforts of churchmen, aided since 1846 by assistance from a parliamentary grant. The voluntary schools provided a good secular education combined with religious instruction. The following short statement will show the amount of money contributed by churchmen to educational purposes from 1811 to 1876.

For purchasing sites for schools, and building and maintaining them from 1811 to 1870 .	£23,900,000
For building, enlarging, and maintaining schools from 1870 to 1876	£3,682,173
Making the enormous sum since 1811 of	£27,582,173

These schools, the result of the piety, labour, and self-sacrifice of all ranks of church people in successive generations, are institutions for which England may well be thankful. They have sprung from the earnest desire of the promoters to do good to their fellow-men. The cost of education in voluntary schools is calculated to be at the rate of £1 12s. per child, whilst in board schools it reaches £2 11s. 6d. The sums contributed by Romanists and all other religious bodies from 1870 to 1876 is £833,709 against the £3,682,173 of churchmen.

One unhappy result of the numerous religious divisions existing in England and Wales is shown in the difficulty of imparting religious instruction in board schools which are supported by rates, as even our simplest and most ancient creed, that of the apostles, is considered to be inadmissible. That the religious difficulty has been immensely exaggerated by politicians, and that the preference of the English for religious education has been abundantly shown, are now established facts. But the eagerness with which dissenters in many parts of Wales have taken up secular education in the board schools to the exclusion of the Bible, is very remarkable; their plea that the schoolmaster is not fitted to impart religious instruction, which should be given only in the Sunday school, is contrary to the opinions of their fathers, and we may add to the doctrine of Christ's religion.

In another branch of work the Church has shown great activity during this century. Up to 1872 the total number of churches built, or entirely rebuilt, was above four thousand. The restorations and enlargements were still more numerous, and over nine thousand churches have been built, rebuilt, or restored during the first seventy years of this century, which have cost in voluntary efforts at least seventeen millions. In 1874 there were nearly 13,200 benefices, which showed an increase of 3200 since the parliamentary inquiry in 1831; and it is well known that every additional church has caused further voluntary outlay for Church schools, parsonage houses, and other details of parochial expenditure. These new parishes had also to be endowed, and the ecclesiastical commissioners acknowledged the receipt of no less than one million six hundred and fifty-five thousand pounds from private

benefactions for endowments of churches up to October, 1873. Parsonage houses in 1834 numbered 5900, and were increased in 1874 to over 11,000.¹

One of the signs of renewed life and activity in the Church during the present reign has been the revival of the meetings of convocation. It has been already stated that the abandonment in 1665 of the power which convocation previously possessed of imposing taxes upon themselves and granting subsidies to the crown, operated unfavourably to its meeting. Collier, the church historian, foresaw this probable effect, and its result was shown by the neglect of convocation in future reigns. One of our learned judges says, "It may well be questioned whether the discontinuance of the meetings of convocation did not work mischief to the state as well as to the Church. Probably if convocation had been allowed to sit and make the reforms which time had rendered necessary, the apathy and erastianism which ate into the life of the Church during the last century, and the fruit of those things—the schism caused by the followers of Wesley—would not have occurred; and the state would have escaped the evil of those religious divisions which have influenced and perplexed the legislation of her parliaments, and the policy of her statesmen."²

The appointment of suffragan bishops, which has been renewed during the present reign, is of ancient origin in our church. Professor Stubbs states that suffragans were consecrated to assist the archbishop in Saxon times. After the Norman invasion they were consecrated for the relief of aged bishops and large dioceses. During the Reformation in the reign of Henry VIII. their office was specially retained, and various towns were named for their sees. The act stated that the suffragans were to be appointed by the joint action of the prelates requiring assistance, and the crown, in the following manner. The archbishop or bishop who wished for the assistance of a suffragan was to name two suitable divines, with a request that the sovereign would select one of them for the office, the title of the see being always within the diocese in which the assistant bishop was required. Several were appointed during the sixteenth century, but with the close of Elizabeth's reign the consecration of suffragans ended. The act however remained in force and its revival during the reign of her present majesty is mainly due to the exertions of bishop Wordsworth of Lincoln.

THE COLONIAL CHURCH.

Of late years the progress of the Church in our colonies has very greatly increased. When the extension of the colonial episcopate

¹ For these statistics see *Educational Work of the Church*, published by the National Society. The reader is also referred to *Denominationalists and Secularists*, and *Wrongs and Remedies*, both by F. Calvert, esq., Q.C. Published by Ridgway, London.

² See Phillimore's *Ecclesiastical Law*. vol. ii., pp. 1932, 1933.

was first urged upon churchmen, some were of opinion that it was better to increase the number of colonial and missionary clergy before seeking funds for bishoprics, which had better be founded when the clergy became more numerous. Experience has shown that this opinion was erroneous. The Anglican communion is episcopal; its superintendents are bishops, and in the widely scattered population amongst whom the clergy have to minister, their employments are sufficiently arduous without the work of organization and arrangement which properly comes under a bishop's eye. We have seen the ill result of an insufficient episcopate in the mother country, and it has been plainly proved that the establishment of bishoprics in our colonies has led to a steady and rapid increase in the clergy of each of the dioceses formed.¹

In 1840 the colonial bishoprics fund was commenced by large grants from the S.P.C.K. and S.P.G. That same year the bishops met at Lambeth under the presidency of archbishop Howley, in order to decide which of our colonies most required episcopal supervision. Two sees were endowed by the munificence of that excellent lady, the baroness Burdett-Coutts, namely, Adelaide in Australia, and Capetown in South Africa. In one year, doctor Gray, the earnest and energetic bishop of the latter see, had added fourteen clergy and ten catechists to his diocese. In 1858 the same lady endowed a see for British Columbia with an additional provision for the maintenance of the clergy. Saint Augustine's college for missionary students was opened in June, 1848, the grounds, in which stood the ruins of the old abbey, having been purchased a few years previously by Beresford Hope, esq., M.P., for this purpose. Thus when more than twelve hundred years had passed after the foundation of the abbey by Ethelbert, the ground was again dedicated to God's service, and from this college at Canterbury many a devoted missionary has gone forth to spread the glad tidings of the gospel. The third jubilee of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel was held in London in 1851 in Westminster Abbey, when representatives of the American, colonial, and Scotch churches joined with the English prelates in the administration of the Holy Communion, and the late prince Consort presided the following day at a public meeting in Saint Martin's hall. In the report of the S.P.G. for 1876 it is mentioned that there are sixty-two colonial and missionary bishops with a very large staff of clergy, labouring in Asia and Africa, Australia and the Pacific, America and the West Indies.

With the Church in New Zealand the name of its noble bishop Selwyn will ever be connected. Educated at Eton and Cambridge where he had won high honours, with a bright prospect before him in his native country, he at once obeyed the call to that arduous post, and in 1841 sailed for his distant diocese. How he laboured amongst the natives to whom he was in every sense a

¹ *The Extension of the Colonial Episcopate.* A sermon preached by Rev. W. R. Churton, Feb. 11, 1877.

father, how he built up the Church in that colony, how he sailed in his mission vessel, the Southern Cross, to sow the seeds of gospel truth amongst the islands of the Pacific, are events too recent and too well known to need more than a passing notice. And when after twenty-six years the bishopric of Lichfield was offered to him, it was only after earnest solicitation that he consented to forego the hardships and dangers and uncertain income of his colonial see. How well he ruled this large and difficult home diocese, and secured the attachment of those committed to his care, was shown by the heartfelt sorrow of that large concourse of churchmen who met around his grave in the cathedral close of Lichfield.

As the name of Selwyn is connected with New Zealand so is that of Feild with the icy shores and rocky inlets of the diocese of Newfoundland. From the year of his appointment in 1844 to that of his death in 1876, the labours of this devoted bishop never ceased. In his church-ship, the Hawk, he sailed during his long episcopate many thousands of miles, visiting the wild fishing coves and scattered settlements of this far northern diocese. There he laboured with other university men induced by his example to give up the comforts and the friends of home; there, on the shores of the wild Atlantic they braved the long winters, the journeys through snow and ice, the voyages to the remote coasts of Labrador; and in their devotion to the cause of God they thought all labours light if by its means they might win souls for Christ. A traveller in North America relates that while resting at a lonely inn, he was roused at night by the sound of a solitary voice chanting the psalms. On enquiring the next morning, he found that his fellow traveller was the bishop of Newfoundland. The following verses are taken from a short poem of which this incident has formed the theme.

“Here are no old collegiate walls,
No mighty minster fair and strong:
Whence caught this wild north-western waste
The Church’s evensong?

Head of the Church, for ever near,
Hear thou thy servant’s evening hymn;
Give that lone voice a power to raise
From sleep more dark and dim.

Be it a witness to thy name,
For truth, for love, for order dear,
Charming the sinner from his path,
Soothing the exile’s ear.”¹

Many other Christian heroes, saintly bishops, and devoted clergy, live in the history of our colonial Church; but our limits forbid us to say more. Each year adds to the number of churches, colleges, schools, and communicants, whilst English ladies are aiding the cause, as the Zenana missions in India can testify, and in many

¹ See the *Memoir of Edward Feild, D.D., bishop of Newfoundland*, by Rev. H. W. Tucker, M.A.

cases the labours of the colonial and missionary clergy are shared and lightened by wives and sisters who prove themselves true helpmates of these servants of the cross.

A few words must be added respecting those strictly missionary bishops, separated for their work amongst the heathen beyond the jurisdiction of the British crown. The names of bishops Mackenzie and Patteson at once occur to us. Mackenzie, who headed the universities' mission to central Africa, struggling with the peculiar difficulties of his position, opening the way for further efforts, was struck down by the deadly fever of the land, and laid to rest in the lonely forest on the shores of that continent. Patteson was the son of one of our well known judges, and blessed like many celebrated men with a mother of superior character, who was a member of the Coleridge family. Eton and Oxford may well be proud to number him amongst their scholars: ordained in 1853, appointed to a pleasant curacy in Devonshire in the midst of relatives and friends, in easy circumstances with a happy future opening before him, John Coleridge Patteson left all, and joining bishop Selwyn, devoted his talents, his fortune, and his life to mission work amongst the islands of the Pacific. After his consecration as missionary bishop of Melanesia his aged father wrote in 1861—"I thank God that it has pleased him to spare my life until I heard of your being consecrated; . . . may it please him to prolong your life many years, but if not, may you have laid such foundations for the spread of God's word . . . that when it pleases him to summon you hence you may have a consciousness of having advanced all the works as securely as it seems fit to the Holy Spirit they should be advanced." And in writing home the son replied—"How I think of these islanders! They are my children now: may God enable me to do my duty to them." And well did he do so, visiting them in their island homes, bringing them to the knowledge of a Saviour, nursing them in sickness, joining with them in their sorrows and their joys, till in 1871 he died a martyr's death, pierced by the arrows of those who sought to avenge the injuries inflicted by some of the lawless traders of those seas—avenged, alas, upon one who was their best and noblest friend! But, by God's providence, Patteson had so matured his system that it could work without him; it continues to prosper, and a son of the late bishop Selwyn is now bishop of Melanesia.¹

We have thus the blessing of a laborious ministry, a multiplied episcopate, a Church spreading forth into every land, and the word of God constantly translated into some new tongue, whilst those who have watched the progress of the gospel in our colonies cannot but acknowledge that the foundation of additional bishoprics must be regarded as one of the most important works accomplished in this generation by the Church of England.

¹ See the deeply interesting *Life of Bishop Patteson*, by Miss Yonge.

THE AMERICAN EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

The episcopal Church of the United States is another branch of the great Anglican communion. We mentioned that its first bishop was consecrated by the bishops of the Scottish episcopal Church in 1784; our American colonies had then obtained their independence of the mother country, after a long struggle in which the churches belonging to our communion had been almost destroyed. In the province of Virginia at the beginning of the war in 1776, there were sixty-four churches and ninety-one clergy; at the close of the war many churches were in ruins and only twenty-eight clergy remained. While doctor Seabury was in this country seeking ordination, doctor White, an episcopal clergyman who had great influence with his countrymen, and with general Washington who attended his church, succeeded in gathering together the scattered remains of episcopalians in the states, and by his quiet but unwearied activity a convention of churchmen of the different states met at Philadelphia in October, 1785. It was then resolved to send a letter to the archbishop of Canterbury, in which they laid before him their proposed liturgy, which differed in very few particulars from that of the parent Church, and they added a request that he would consecrate, as bishops of their Church, those clergy whom they should send over for that purpose.

This petition from Philadelphia, coming from the different states after the consecration of bishop Seabury, showed that that proceeding was not against the wishes of the American government; it therefore met with a favourable reply. Two clergymen proceeded to England, doctor White, bishop elect for Pennsylvania, and doctor Provoost for New York, both of whom were consecrated in Lambeth chapel in February, 1787. The following year the bishop elect of Virginia also came to Lambeth for consecration. The growth of the Anglican communion in the United States has been very marked. In 1877 it numbered fifty-eight bishops with a proportionate number of clergy, and continues in close communion with the Church of England.

The best evidence of real progress in a church is the growth of a missionary spirit. Of this the American Church gives proof; its missionary work like that of our S.P.G. is of a two-fold character—the maintenance of Christian truth amongst its outlying population in the far west, and the spread of it amongst the heathen. Such is the episcopal Church of America—a witness for God's word, a city set upon an hill whose light shines from afar, and illuminates many dark places of the earth.

The experiment of a great conference of bishops of the Anglican communion called together by the archbishop of Canterbury and meeting under his presidency has been twice tried, and each time with great advantage to the interests of our Church. The first episcopal conference of this kind was held at Lambeth palace in 1867. The second, at which one hundred bishops assembled under

the presidency of our primate, is the most noteworthy event connected with our Church in 1878. These episcopal standard-bearers from all parts of the world met to consult with our home bishops for the spiritual good of all branches of the great Anglican communion. Our sister Church of America was well represented, and bishops from Ireland, Scotland, our Indian empire, and our colonies in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and various other countries formed a striking spectacle, which is calculated to impress the thoughtful mind with the important and increasing influence thus exercised throughout the extent of our vast empire.

We have now brought this sketch of Anglican church history down to the present day. It is one of trials and vicissitudes, of errors and reforms; but by God's grace the Anglican Church has continued to enlarge her influence and strengthen her hold over the souls of men. And though difficulties and dangers lie around her, and the opposition of open enemies is too often encouraged by the lukewarm support of half-hearted friends, she pursues her steadfast path, confident in her trust in Him who has said, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

"Crowns and thrones may perish,
Kingdoms rise and wane,
But the Church of Jesus
Constant will remain;
Gates of hell can never
'Gainst that Church prevail;
We have Christ's own promise,
And that cannot fail."

INDEX.

- ABBEY** lands sold to laymen, 219
Abbot, archbishop, 306; church affairs, 319; his death, 328
Abjuration, oath of, 431
Acts of parliament against usurpations of Rome and its friars, 188; for the propagation of the gospel in Wales, 369; for toleration and comprehension, 418; test and corporation acts repealed, 474
Adrian IV., pope, 147
Advowson, 111
African Church devastated by the Vandals, 17
Aidan, bishop, 47
Alban, the martyr, 4
Alcuin, 74
Aldhelm, 58
Alfred the Great, 83; becomes king, 84; his navy; founds Winchester, 85; letter to bishop of London, 87; death and character, 89
Alfrid, king of Northumbria, 55
Allegiance, oath of, and pope's brief, 303
Alphage, archbishop of Canterbury, 104
Ambassador, French, after the massacre, 276
America, bishops required there, 454
Anabaptists, rise of, 279; obtain a settlement in Holland, 281; their confession of faith, come into England and are called baptists, 281
Angles, 19
Anglo-Norman settlers in Ireland, 253
Anglo-Saxons. Kingdoms, 21; coronation oath, 63; laws, 93; independence of their church, 114; its endowments, their national character and unbroken descent, 135, 136
Annates, or first-fruits, given to the crown, 216
Anselm, 131; his death, 139; his advice to Alexander, king of Scotland, 140
Antinomians, 378
Appropriations of livings to the monasteries, 171
Argyle, earl of, made a marquis, 347
Arian heresy, 9
Armagh, bishopric of, founded, 14
Arminianism, origin of the term, 321
Armorica, now Brittany, 20, 35
Arran, earl of, made regent, 247
Arthur and his bards, 19
Articles, the six, 222
Articles of religion published, 232; passed, 266
Arundel, archbishop of Canterbury, his synod at Oxford, 194
Asser, 85
Association for puritan lecturers, 325
Athelney, island of, 84
Athelstan, 94
Attila, king of the Huns, 27
Augustin, bishop of Hippo, 17
Augustine, archbishop of Canterbury, 38; conference with British bishops, second conference, 40; his death, 42; his successors, 43
BABINGTON'S conspiracy, 277
Baillie, principal, his opinions, 337
Bancroft, archbishop, 301; strict as to the rubrics, 302; his death, 306
Bangor, bishopric of, 30; monks massacred, 41
Baptismal fonts, 10
Bards, Welsh, account of them, 179
"Barebones" parliament, 375
Barons and earl of Leicester, 174
Battle Abbey, 120
Baxter and Bunyan, 415
Beaton, cardinal, archbishop of St. Andrews, 223; persecutes the reformers, 248; is assassinated, 249
Becanceld, in Kent, assembly there, 61
Becket, archbishop of Canterbury, 143; quarrels with Henry II., 144; returns to England, 145; his murder at Canterbury, his shrine there, 146
Bede, the venerable, 58, 59
Bell, doctor, 472
Benedictine monks, 95; first in England at Glastonbury, 96
Bevan, madam, her liberality, 445; will disputed, and her money settled by chancery, gratitude due to her by the Welsh, 446
Beveridge, bishop of St. Asaph, 432
Beverley, John of, 55

- Bible, English, published by Miles Coverdale, Cranmer's, or the Great, 217; the bishops', 268; first published in Scotland, 289; new translation, and remarks on it, 300; Dr. Morgan's Welsh translation, 293; Dr. Parry's revised Welsh translation, 312; S.P.C.K. prints it in Welsh, 445; not neglected in Wales, 467
 Bible Society founded, 464
 Bill of Rights, and settlement of the crown, 420
 Biscop Benedict, 58 [221
 Bishoprics, four chief, 7; five founded,
 Bishops, Danish, in Ireland, 124, 148; Scottish go to York for consecration, 130; chosen by chapters of cathedrals, 156; their estates sequestered, 350; restored to the house of lords, 386
 Bond drawn by lords of congregation, 251
 Bonner, bishop of London, 260
 Book of sports put forth, 308; again introduced, 328
 "Bounty, queen Anne's," 433
 Boyne, battle of, 429
 Bradshaw, the regicide, 364
 Bradwardine, 186
 Breda, Charles's declaration from, 384
 Britain after the Romans depart, 18
 British bishops at Arles, 8
 British Church, its origin and strength, 16; St. Martin at Canterbury, 37
 Britons, their progress, 12; retain Strathclyde, 20
 Brown, Robert, the first seceder from the English Church, he returns to the Church, 286
 Bruce, Robert, 181
 Brychan, 25
 Buckingham, duke of, assassinated, 315
 Bull, bishop of St. David's, 432
 Bunyan, 415
 Burdett-Coutts, baroness, 477
 Burgess, bishop of St. David's, 468
 Burial of dead without a service, 351; silent approved by puritans, 352
 Burnet, bishop of Salisbury, 417

 CADWALLON, British prince, 46
 Caerworgorn, 24
 Caledonia, ancient name of Scotland, 6
 Cæsar, Julius, account of the Britons, 1
 Calvin, John, his influence, 263
 Calvinistic doctrines, 317
 Cambridge university, treatment of, by the rebels, 363
 Cameronians, sect of, 397; fall into oblivion, 424
 Canons passed at Arles, 8; of Scotch Church, 1817, 470
 Canons, secular and regular, 157
 Canterbury cathedral and Lanfranc, Canute and his sons, 105 [130
 Caractacus, 2
 Cardinals, college of, 127
 Carnarvon castle, 181
 Caroline books, 75
 Carranza, Mary's confessor, 239
 Cartright and puritans at Cambridge, 284; his "Admonitions," 286
 Cashel, synod at, 148
 Catechism, church, 227
 Cathedral of St. Patrick, Dublin, 161
 Cathedrals, date of foundation, 113
 Cavaliers and roundheads, 350
 Caxton and art of printing, 202
 Celestius, 13
 Celibacy, 69
 Cerdic, the west Saxon, 22
 Chad, bishop, 52
 Channel Islands, 309
 Chantry lands and chapels, 220
 Charity schools, 466
 Charlemagne and the Roman see, 73; becomes emperor of the west, 75
 Charles I., his accession, his marriage, 313; goes to Scotland, 325; founds parish schools there, passes act called the "surrenders," wishes to make provision for the prelates, 326; undecided in character, 346; again visits Scotland, 347; leaves Whitehall, 349; at Hampton Court, at Carisbrooke castle, 361; taken to Hurst castle, his trial, 364; sentenced to death, 365; his execution, his chaplain Herbert, 366; his burial, 367; his character, 368
 Charles II. comes to Scotland, he is defeated at Worcester, escapes to France, 375; lands in England, 385; dispensing power, 391; his death, 400
 Charles Edward dies, 1788, 470
 Charles. Rev. T., of Bala, his Sunday schools, joins the methodists, opinions as to separation, 460; British and Foreign Bible Society, 464
 Chelsea and Greenwich hospitals, 430
 Chillingworth, 330
 Christianity, when introduced, 2
 Christ's hospital founded, 235
 Church festivals, 7; abolished in Scotland, 352 [223
 Church of England reformed, not new,
 Church of Gaul, 16; of Perranzabuloe, 26; Church and state, 63; Church in Scotland, places itself under protection of Rome, 150; becomes independent of see of York, 202
 Church, endowments of, private benevolence, 223, 233; high and low, 417; rates abolished, 474

- Church Missionary Society, 464
 Churches, parochial, their origin, 17; their foundation, 57; in Wales, 25, 110
 Churchyards, their origin, 68
 Civil war in Scotland, 252
 Clarendon, constitutions of, 144
 Clarendon, lord lieut. of Ireland, 426
 Clarendon opposes the dispensing power, 391
 Clergy, parochial, 56; secular and regular, 98; their disputes, 188; Norman, in Wales, 141; foreign, intruded by the popes, 170; their duty in matter of taxes, 183; persecuted, 353; tyranny towards them, 370
 Cloveshoo synod, bishops present, 67
 Clovis, king of the Franks, 28
 Cobham lord (Sir John Oldcastle), condemned to death, escapes, and is taken and burned, 199
 Colet, dean, founds St. Paul's school, 209
 Collection at church doors, 430
 College, Saint Augustine's missionary, 477
 Colleges, Douay and St. Omer, Jesuit priests from them, 268; in Scotland, their foundation, 448
 Colonial Church; bishoprics fund, 476
 Common Prayer, its use prohibited, 359; re-established, 386
 Commons, house of, rises in importance, 184; fresh attack on the Church, 318; committee for removing "scandalous ministers," 344; wish to expel bishops from house of lords, 348
 Conference between Romanist and reformed divines, 258
 Confession, 99; Romanist oath taken, 311
 Conventicle act, 390
 Convention of 1689, 421; it abolishes episcopacy, 422
 Convocation, houses of, 185; of the English Church, repeatedly disclaimed papal authority, 213; meets, reign of Elizabeth, 258; canons framed by, 301; canon against Socinianism, 343; is threatened by the mob, 344; gives up voting supplies, 387; the two houses do not agree, 430; prorogued for some years, 432; prorogued indefinitely, 441; remarks on, 441; re-assembling of, 480
 Constantine the Great, a Christian, 7
 Constantinople made seat of government, 11; taken by Turks, 198
 Constantius Chlorus, 5
 Continuity of English Church, 223
 Cornish men and bishop Trelawny, 411
 Cornwall and Saint Piramus, 26; earldom of, its bishopric, 125
 Corporation act, 390
 Councils, provincial and general, 8; council of Arles, 8; of Nice, 9; second, 73; of Constantinople, 71; of Frankfort, 74; at Calne, 101; the third of the Lateran, papal election changed then, 150; the fourth Lateran, 162; of Lyons, 168; of Constance assemblies, 196; of Constance dissolved, of Florence, of Basle, 198; of Trent, 230, 267; four first general councils, 259
 Counties and hundreds, 85; southwestern Scotch, and patronage, 395; "rabble" the clergy, 395
 Covenant, national, its signature demanded, 330, 338; solemn league and, 351; its signature insisted on, 352
 Covenanters burn acts of parliament, 397
 Coverdale's Bible, 217
 Cox, Richard, at Frankfort, 263
 Cranmer, rise of, his opinion of the divorce, 212; becomes archbishop of Canterbury, 213; his Bible, 217; degraded, 243; his public confession, his martyrdom, 244
 Creeds, Nicene and Athanasian, 9, 10
 Cromwell, Oliver, expels presbyterians from the house of commons, 358; subdues royalists at Preston, 364; his speech at trial of the king, 365; subdues Ireland, 373; made protector, 375; appoints major generals over England, his parliaments, does not give toleration to the Church or Romanists, 376; his death, 380; his character, 381; his successors in Ireland, 398
 Cromwell, Richard, resigns, 383
 Crowther, bishop, 465
 Croyland, abbot, and church bells, 100
 Crusades, and Peter the hermit, 131
 Culdees in Scotland, 33; their chapel at St. Andrews, 397
 Cunedda Wledig, 25
 DANES or Northmen, 81; in East Anglia, destroy monasteries, 83; in Wales, they invade Ireland, 91
 Dark ages, 80
 Declaration prefixed to thirty-nine articles, 317
 Decretals, the forged, 89
 "Delinquents," new term, 349
 Destruction of ecclesiastical edifices in Scotland, 252
 Dinorth, abbot of Bangor, 40
 Dioceses formed in Scotland, 106; Scottish, list of, 394

- Diocletian persecution, 4
 Directory, account of it, 351; use of, enforced, 359
 Discipline, first book of, 269; second book, 287
 Divines, assembly of, at Westminster, 351; of Church of England, 400—402
 Doctrines of Trent compared with our articles, 230—232
 Dominicans and Franciscans, their great influence, 188
 Domesday book, 130
 Dort, synod of, 322
 Drogheda, siege and massacre, 373
 Druids, 1
 Dubricius, or Dyfrig, bishop of Caerleon, 16, 29; his synod at Brefi, dies at Bardsey island, 30
 Dundee, assembly at, 288
 Dundee, viscount, death of, 419
 Dunkeld, bishop Scot, of, 161
 Dunstan, 95; becomes archbishop of Canterbury, 97; his death, 102
 Durham besieged by Scotch army, 340

 EASTER controversy, 40; question settled, 56
 Eastern or Greek Church, 169
 Ecclesiastical commission, 474; edifices destroyed in Scotland, 271
 Edgar aids Dunstan to eject the clergy from the monasteries, 97
 Edgar the Atheling, 108; sister Margaret marries Malcolm III. of Scotland, 122
 Edict of Nantes, 276; revoked in France, 405
 Edinburgh, bishopric of, founded, 328
 Edmund Ironside, 105
 Education encouraged by the Reformation, 289; education bill of 1840, exertions of Church, government assists with grants, act of 1870, 474; effect of religious division, 475
 Edward the Confessor, 106; his charter to Westminster abbey, 111
 Edward the Elder, 93
 Edward the Martyr, 101
 Edward I., wars with Welsh, 177; his son born at Carnarvon, 181
 Edward II. and Edward III., 185
 Edward III. and Black Prince, their wars, 186; king and parliament protest against papal exactions, and refuse tribute to the pope, 188; his death, 190
 Edward IV. succeeds, 202 [203
 Edward V. and his brother murdered, Edward VI., his death and character, 236; leaves crown to Lady Jane Grey, 237; state of religion in his reign, 236

 Edwin, king of Northumbria, 44
 Edwin and Elgiva, 96
 Egbert, archbishop of York, 60
 Egbert, king of west Saxons, unites the Anglo-Saxon kingdom, 81
 Egfrid, 54
 Elizabeth, queen, her difficulties; not acknowledged by the pope, 256; crowned by bishop of Carlisle, 257; her dangerous position, 276, 285; her death, 295
 Election of bishops, 113; explained, 215 [127
 Election of popes, change in the mode, Electress of Hanover, Sophia, 431
 Elfric, archbishop, 103
 Eliot, Sir John, 314; and Pym, 318; imprisoned, dies in the tower, 322
 Empire, east and west, 11
 Empress Irene, 73
 Endowments of the Church, 113
 "Engagement," the independents' covenant, 369
 England at the death of William II., 134 [277
 English Church opposed by two parties, English ladies assist missionary work, 478
 Episcopacy and the Scotch reformers, 249; abolished, 360; re-established in Scotland, 393
 Episcopal Church, moderation of, 394; its progress in Scotland, her bishops make canons, 446; much injured by Jacobite rising, 1745, vengeance taken on it, penal statute of 1746, ditto of 1748, 447; in America, 479; its missionary spirit, 480
 Episcopal lands sold, 362
 Episcopalians, Scotch, and presbyterians, attend at Hampton court, 303; petition to queen Anne, 438; chapels ordered to be closed, 439
 Episcopate, increase of, 476; in North America, 462
 Erasmus and study of Greek, 209
 Erastian views, 228
 Erigena, John Scotus, book against transubstantiation, 86
 Errors, rise of, in the Church, 78
 Erskine, of Dun, 288
 Ethelbert, king of Kent, 37
 Etheldreda, queen, 54
 Ethelred and the Danes, 101; his queen, Emma, 102; he retires to Normandy, 105
 Ethelwulf visits Rome, his charter to the Church, 81
 Evangelical movement, 463
 Evans, Christmas, and the baptists, 468
 Evelyn, John, 402; extracts from his diary, 377

- FAIRFAX**, general, 358 ; lady, 365
Falkland, lord, killed, 350
Fastidius, 13
Feild, bishop, 477
Feoffees prosecuted, 325
Ferrar, bishop of St. David's, 240
Festival and Corporation of Sons of the Clergy, 434
Feudal system, 122
Fifth monarchy men, 378
Fifths to clergy obtained with much difficulty, 377
Finan, bishop, 48
First-fruits and tenths, 183
Fisher, bishop, executed, 216
Fitzralph, archbishop of Armagh, 187
Five members, king attempts to arrest, [349
Five-mile act, 390
Flemings settle in Pembrokeshire, 140
Fletcher, rev. J., of Madeley, 457
Friars, their increasing influence, 169 ; mendicant, four orders described, 163
GALLICAN liturgy, 16, 42
Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, 221 ; and Bonner imprisoned, 228 ; reinstated, 237 ; his death, 242
Gaul, Church of, 16
General assembly of the kirk at Leith, 273 ; re-establishes episcopacy in Scotland, 303 ; assembly of 1638, 339 ; condemns episcopacy. deposes the prelates, brings scandalous charges against them, 340 ; remarks thereon, 341 ; in Scotland not allowed by Cromwell, 379
Geneva form of prayer, 270
George II. succeeds to throne, 442
George III., his popularity, 454
Germanus, bishop of Auxerre, 15
Gildas, 35
Giraldus Cambrensis at St. David's, chosen bishop by the clergy, 149 ; again chosen bishop by the Welsh, 156
Glasgow, archbishop Spotswood, of, 304 ; general assembly of, 1638, 339 ; disgraceful attack on the bishops, 340 ; the cathedral attacked, 421
Glenalmond college, 470
Godolphin, Margaret, 403
Goths in Gaul, 27
Gouge, Rev. T., his schools for the poor, 442
Grand remonstrance, 349
Greek and Latin churches, 193 ; failure to reconcile them, 198
Greenshields persecuted in Edinburgh, 439
Gregory, bishop of Rome, 37 ; his death, 43
Gregory II. of Rome, 71
Gregory VII. (Hildebrand), 127 ; his death, 128
Grey, lady Jane, 237
Grimbald, 86
Grindal, archbishop of York, afterwards of Canterbury, 282 ; his death, 283
Grostête, bishop of Lincoln, 171
Guizot's, M., remarks on Strafford, 345
Gunpowder plot, 302
HACKET, doctor, and the soldier, 359 ; and the burial service, 391
Hamilton, marquis of, 339
Hamilton, Patrick, burned, 246
Hampton court conference, 298
Harold subdues the Welsh, 107 ; succeeds Edward, 108
Hastings, battle of, 120
Hatfield synod, 56
Henderson, Alexander, 337, 340
Hengist and the Jutes, 18
Henry I., pope's complaints to him, 141 ; his queen Matilda, 137 ; brother Robert in Cardiff castle, 138
Henry II., 143 ; conquers Ireland, 147 ; appoints a Norman to see of St. David's, 149 ; Norman progress in England at his death, 151
Henry III., 166
Henry IV., his persecuting statute, 198
Henry IV., emperor of Germany, and Gregory VII., 128.
Henry V. dies, 196 ; his widow marries Sir Owen Tudor, 201
Henry VI., wars of the roses, 200 ; imprisoned and killed, 201
Henry VIII., 207 ; receives the title of Defender of the Faith, 209 ; his divorce, 211 ; excommunicated by the pope, 214 ; marries Anne Boleyn, forbids appeals to Rome, forbids the annates to be paid to Rome, 214 ; his death and character, 225
Herbert's poem on the British Church, 235
Hermits, 23
High church party, 464
High commission court, 259 ; abolished, 297
Hilda, the abbess, 51
Hoadly, bishop of Bangor, 441 ; his sermons, 432
Holyhead, or Caergybi, 33
Homage from Scotland, why claimed, 181
Homilies, Saxon, 48 : first book of, 227 ; second book of, 266
Hooper, bishop of Gloucester, and episcopal robes, 230, 240
Howel Dda, synod at Whitland, code of laws, 94 ; his death, 95

- Huguenots escape to England, 276
 Huntingdon, Selina, countess of, her chapels and college, 458
 Huss burned, 196
 ILTUTUS, or Iltyd, 16
 Image worship controversy, 71; Britain protests against it, 74
 Immaculate conception, dogma of, 193
 Impositions declared legal, 307
 Impropiations, 193
 Ina, king of west Saxons, his laws, his church shot, dies at Rome, his school there, 61
 Independents, their supposed origin, 286; found state of New England, their intolerance, 316; increasing power of, 353
 Indulgences, 154; sold by Tetzel, 208
 Indulgence offered to Scotch ministers, 396
 Infanta of Spain, proposed marriage of, 307
 Injunctions published in reign of Elizabeth, 258
 Inquisition, its origin, 165
 Interdict, sentence of, described, 145; in England, 158 [138
 Investitures. Henry I. and the pope, Ireland known as Scotia, 6; derived from Ierne, 26; her missionaries, 30; Columbanus, love of learning, 57; state of learning, 76; its state after subjection to England, 252; papal power introduced there, 253; reformation there, 290; poverty of Church, Scriptures not translated, Romish intrigues, 291; insurrection, earls of Desmond and Tyrone, 292; insurrection there, 309; English laws, circuits, and counties, 309; poverty of clergy, spoliation of the Church, 310; a parliament called there, 311; boldness of Romanists there, 332; Sir Phelim O'Neill, 347; massacre of 1641, 348; episcopacy and use of the Common Prayer abolished, 373; in time of James I., Cromwell's settlements there, 398; parliament and reformed Church restored, 399; ill feeling there, 425; rebellion of 1798, the union, Roman catholic emancipation, Church disestablished, 471
 Ireland, notices of, pp. 6, 13, 14, 26, 30, 43, 57, 76, 91, 124, 147, 161, 252, 290, 309, 332, 347, 373, 397, 425, 471
 Irish Church, unsatisfactory state of, 255
 Irish Scots from Iona, 48
 Irish Scots give their name to Scotland, 26
 Isle of man, 14
 JACOBITE rising in 1815, 440
 James I. of Scotland, 202
 James I. (VI. of Scotland), his accession, 296; visits Edinburgh, 305; his death, 312
 James II. wishes to repeal the test act, 405; declaration of toleration, attacks the universities, 407
 James IV. of Scotland marries Margaret, daughter of Henry VII., 203
 James V., his death, 247
 James VI., earl of Murray regent, 273; requests presbyterian ministers to pray for his mother, 289
 Jerome of Prague burned, 196
 Jerusalem, Godfrey, king of, 132
 Jesuits, the foundation of the order, 224; they foment religious divisions, 264
 Jewel, bishop, his sermons at Paul's Cross, his *Apology*, 268
 Jews; persecution of, 185
 John Alaski, 229
 John, king of England, 156; agrees to pay tribute to the pope, absolved by archbishop, 159
 Jones, Rev. Griffith, his system, circulating charity schools, 443; rules for them, 444; explanation of church catechism, his powers of preaching, his death, 445
 Jones, Rev. Thomas, of Creaton, and the British and Foreign Bible Society, 461
 Jubilee of S.P.G., 477
 Juxon, bishop, account of, 367; made archbishop of Canterbury, 385; succeeded by Sheldon, 387
 KEN, bishop, 419
 Kenneth II. of Scotland, 90
 Kent, men of, 120
 Kildare, earl of, 253
 Knox, John, in castle of St. Andrews, 249; returns to Scotland, 250; preaches at Perth, 251; preaches at St. Andrews, encourages the work of destruction, 252; behaviour to queen Mary, 271; his death and character, 274
 LAITY denied the cup in the communion, 197
 Lambeth articles, 286; chapel restored by Laud, 330
 Lancaster, Joseph, 472
 Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, 124; his devotion to the papal see, 125
 Langton, archbishop of Canterbury 158; his death, 166
 Latimer, bishop of Worcester, 241

Laud, bishop of London, 318; his life and character, and diocese of Saint David's, 320; bishop of London, 321; firmness in correcting abuses, 224; becomes archbishop, 328; not Romanizing, 330; his trial, 354; condemned to death, executed, 355; sketch of and his times, 357
 Laws ecclesiastical in Edgar's reign, 99
 Lay influence in Scotland, 347
 Learning, and study of Scripture increases, 205
 Legate, the first papal, 123
 Leicester, the earl of, supports the puritans, 282; tries to obtain grants, 284
 Leo, bishop of Rome, 28
 Leo, emperor of the east, 71
 Leo IX., pope, 116
 Lesley made earl of Leven, 347
 Lincoln, Grostôte, bishop of, 171
 Liturgy, the Sarum, 131; English, slightly altered for Scotland, 327; introduced in Scotland in 1637, 336
 Llanbadarn-fawr, 32
 Llandaff, synod at, 91; bishopric, 102; bishop Teilo, 31
 Llewelyn ab Iorwerth, 173
 Llewelyn, last prince of Wales, 178; his brother David executed, 178
 Loans forced, 314
 Lollards, their opinions, 194
 Londonderry, its siege, 427
 Long parliament, remnant of, 383
 Lord's day, observations on it, 329
 Lothians granted by Edgar to Kenneth III., 100
 Loyola, Ignatius, 224
 Luther and Tetzel, 208

MACKENZIE, bishop, 478
 Magna Charta, 160
 Mainwaring, doctor, 318; made bishop, 330
 Malcolm II., of Scotland, 104
 Mar, earl of, regent, 273
 Marches, lords of the, 133
 Marriage, 114; of clergy, 227
 Marston Moor, battle of, 358
 Martel, Charles, 72
 Martin Bruce and Peter Martyr, 229
 Martin de Tours, 140
 Martin Marprelate, his pamphlets, 286; received by the Scotch, 289
 Mary becomes queen, marries Philip II., 237; restores Romanism, restores the first-fruits to Church, 238; her death, 244; deprives Irish prelates of their sees, 254
 Mary of Guise becomes regent of Scotland, 250; her death, 252

Mary, infant queen of Scots, 247; sent to France for education, 250; returns to Scotland, 271; marries Darnley, marries Bothwell, a prisoner in Lochleven castle, compelled to resign her crown, escapes into England, 272; a rallying point to the Romanists, 273; is executed in 1587, 278
 Mass, explanation of it, 150 [275
 Massacre of St. Bartholomew, in France, 287; his speech to James VI., 290; sent to the Tower, 303
 Menno, Simon, 280
 Mercia, Christianity introduced there and in other Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, 49
 Merlin, 19
 Methodists still in communion with the Church, 460, 466
 Middle way, 235 [473
 Miller, canon, his speech at Islington, 422
 Ministers desired to pray for William and Mary, 422
 Miracles, 39
 Missionaries from Britain and Scotia, 13
 Missionary bishoprics, 478
 Missions, benefit and duty of, 465.
 Mohammedanism, 72 [392
 Mompesson, Rev. W., and the plague, 422
 Monasteries, their origin, their founder, 23; of east and west, their benefits in Britain, 24; increase, 69; dates of foundation, 111; decay in discipline, 157; the smaller dissolved, 217; the greater dissolved, 218
 Monastic life, 79; system, remarks on, 219
 Monk, general, in Scotland, 375; stops a meeting in Fife, 379; and Charles II., 384
 Monopolies, the, 308
 Montague, doctor, 317
 Montrose, marquis of, defeated at Philiphaugh, 359; his defeat and execution, 374
 More, Sir Thomas, executed, 217
 Mortmain, statute of, 184
 Morton, earl of, his avarice, 287
 Munzer and John of Leyden, 280

NASEBY, battle of, 359
 National Church, 99
 National Society, 466
 New England, episcopalians persecuted there, 425
 "New Model," 358
 Newcastle besieged by Scotch army, 340
 Ninian, 13
 Non-jurors, 415; stringent laws against, in Scotland, 440

- Normandy taken by the French, 161
 Normans or Northmen, 117; invade England, 118; oppress the Anglo-Saxons, 123; barons gain settlements in Wales, 132; state of the country after the Norman invasion, 204
 Northumberland, duke of, beheaded, 237
 Norway, Christianity introduced there, 115
- OATES, Titus, his conspiracy, 391
 Oath of allegiance to William and Mary, 415
 Odo, brother of William I., 125
 Offa, king of Mercia, builds a church at St. Alban's, 76; Offa's dyke, 78
 Orders of the Church increased, 103; of Saint John and the templars, 152
 Ormonde, marquis of, commands in Ireland, 373; duke of, lord lieut., 399
 Oswald, king of Northumbria, 46
 Oswy, king of Northumbria, 48; his death, 53
 Oxford movement, 472
 Oxford university, 88; its spirited conduct, 362
- PALATINE, elector, marries princess Elizabeth, becomes king of Bohemia, Palladius, 13 [307]
 Pan-Anglican conferences, 480
 Pandulphus, pope's legate, 159
 Papal power still increases, 89
 Parish churches in Scotland, state of, 326
 Parishes, their origin, 109; in Scotland not altered at Reformation, 304
 Parker, Matthew, archbishop of Canterbury, his consecration, 261; his fitness for his position, 266; his death and character, 277
 Parliament votes only small supplies, 308; first, second, and third of Charles I., 313, 314; crown dependent on it for money, 314; the short, 343; the long, 1640, 344; its feeling against the Church, 348; remnant of it expelled by Cromwell, 375; Scottish, and the covenanters, 395
 Passive obedience, 412
 Patrick, bishop of Ely, 429
 Patriots and puritans, 323
 Patronage, its origin, 56
 Patrons of churches, 111; rights of, restored in Scotland, 393
 Patteson, bishop, 479
 Paulinus, 44
 Pawl Hên, 25
 Pelagian heresy in Britain, 14
 Pelagius, 15
- Penal laws in Scotland partially repealed, 470
 Penances, 60
 Pepin, king of the Franks, gives territories to the pope, 72
 Persecution in Scotland, 223; begins in Mary's reign, 238; by Mary, did not reach Ireland, 255
 Perth, the five articles of, 305
 Peter pence, origin of, 77; appropriated by the popes, 128
 Petition of right, 315; of the bishops to James II., 408
 Philip II. and Spanish armada, 278; his death, 294
 Picts' wall, 6
 Pilgrimages, 69
 Pillage of churches, 228
 Pius IV., letters to queen Elizabeth, nuncio not allowed to land, 265
 Pius V. excommunicates queen Elizabeth, 268
 Plunder of the Church, 226
 Pole, cardinal, papal legate, 238; archbishop of Canterbury, his death, 258
 Politics and reformation in Scotland, Pompina and Claudia, 2 [290]
 Poor rates established, 219
 Pope, his influence increasing, 81; increased power, 127; Alexander III. and the emperor Frederick, 150; Innocent III. excommunicates king John, 158; power at greatest height, 162; disputes with emperor of Germany, 169; Boniface VIII. directs English clergy to pay no taxes; Celestine V., 182; Urban V. demands tribute, 188; Pius IX. appoints hierarchy in England, 474
 Porteus, bishop of Chester, 462
 Powell, Vavasor, 370, 371
 Præmunire, statute of, 190; explained, 216
 Prayer book, first, of Edward VI., 227; used in Dublin cathedral, 254; second of Edward VI., 257; brought into use, 259; examined, 334
 Prayers for the dead, 69
 Prelates ill-treated, committed to the Tower, 348
 Presbyterian services, omission in, 489
 Presbyterianism established in Scotland, 347
 Presbyterians disapprove of the execution of the king, 369; and puritans coming to an agreement, 343; and independents disagree, their remarks on schism, 360; two parties, 398, 413; their intolerance, 414; irritation in England at their conduct in Scotland, 424; oppose toleration in Scotland, 488

- "Pride's purge," 364
 Primer of Henry VIII., 221
 Primitive Church, the intercourse carried on, 267 [412
 Prince of Orange comes to England, 445
 Printing-press, first in Wales, 445
 Prophecys and letter of Grindal, 283
 'Protestant,' origin of the term, 233
 Protestants in Europe supported by Cromwell, 380; Dean Hook's remarks, 429
 Prynne, his libels, 331
 Pudens and Claudia, 2
 Purgatory, 102
 'Puritan,' origin of the term, 264
 Puritans cause dissension, 282; at close of Elizabeth's reign, new race of, 295; millenary petition, 297; in house of commons, 317; remarks on by queen Elizabeth and archbishop Parker, 346; do not object to hold pluralities, 352; bishop Harold Browne on them, 382; their moroseness, 399

QUAKERS, one in pillory, 378

 "RABBLING" of episcopal clergy in Scotland, 421
 Raikes, Mr. Robert, of Gloucester, and Sunday schools, 472
 Reformation in England completed, 269
 Reformation in Scotland, 246
 Reformed exiles at Frankfort, their disputes about the liturgy, 263; they return to England, 264
 Reformers, English, their moderation, 234; English and continental, 267
 Refugees, French and Flemish, their church in Canterbury cathedral, 294
 Relics, 89, 69
 Religion, committee of, 317; state of, in England during the civil war and commonwealth, 380
 Religious affairs at accession of Charles I., 315; divisions, effect of on education, 475
 Resolutioners and remonstrants, 379
 Reynolds, doctor, at conference, 298
 Richard I. in Holy Land, 151
 Ridley, bishop, 241
 Riots in Edinburgh, 337
 Rival popes and councils, 198
 Roderic Mawr, 91
 Rogers, the martyr, 239
 Rollo, first duke of Normandy, 117
 Roman bishops rise to power, 29
 Roman empire declines in power, 11; in the west broken up, 29
 Roman see, its increasing power, 70; its avarice, 166
 Romanist bishops decline the oath of supremacy, 260; letter to Elizabeth, and her reply, 266
 Romanists during first ten years of Elizabeth's reign, 268; separate from the Church in England, 281; excluded from parliament, 391
 Romans in Britain, 1; second visit, 2; leave Britain, 11
 Rome taken by the Goths, 12
 Romish practice of re-baptism and reordination, 282
 Root and branch bill, 348
 Rowlands, Rev. Daniel, open air preaching, 458; at Llanddewi-brefi, 458; chapel at Llangeitho, 459
 Royal standard set up, 350 [364
 Royalist risings subdued by Cromwell, "Rump" parliament, 364
 Rupert, prince, 350

SACHEVERELL, doctor, sermons and trial, 432
 Sacred music, 53; its progress, 284
 Saint Ambrose, 10; Saint Augustine, 37; Saint Basil, 23; Saint Bride, 32; Saint Columba and Iona, 33; Saint David, 31; Saint Jerome, 10; Saint Patrick, 14; Saint Paul, 3
 Saint Alban's abbey and shrine, 77
 Saint Andrews, see of, 90; Kennedy, bishop of, 202; antiquity of the see, cathedral when founded, 396
 Saint Asaph, bishopric, 34
 Saint David's college, Lampeter, 468
 Saint David's, William I. visits it, 129; Giraldus buried there, 156
 Saint Neots, 87
 Saint Paul's cathedral, 112
 Saints, Anglo-Saxon, 129
 Saints, intercession of, 142
 Sancroft, archbishop, 391
 Savoy conference, 386
 Sawtree burned, 193
 Saxons, 18
 Scotland, Irish Scots sail to the Mull of Cantyre, 26; Scotch parliament abolishes authority of the pope, 273; Scotch army in 1640 paid while in England, 340; return to their country, 346; under general Lesley, 1639, sermons, king makes a treaty with, 342; again in England, 352; give up Charles I. to the parliament, 361; Scottish parliament after death of Mary of Guise, 269; kirk a political faction, 374; Scottish prelates consecrated, 394; Scottish bishops did not neglect the succession, 469; clergy of English and Irish orders, 471; increased influence of episcopal Church, 471

- Scotland, notices of, pp. 6, 26, 33, 90, 93, 100, 104, 106, 122, 130, 139, 150, 161, 181, 185, 202, 223, 246, 269, 287, 303, 325, 336, 346, 351, 374, 379, 393, 413, 420, 438, 446, 469
- Scriptures, Holy, withheld from the people, 192; the people wish to study them, 199
- Seabury, doctor, consecration of, 462; remarks on, 469
- Sectaries, the Scotch complain of them, 363
- Sects, opinion of a presbyterian writer, 378
- Selwyn, bishop, 477
- Seminary priests, their treasonable practices, 281
- Services of Church in Latin, 143
- Seven bishops, trial of, 409
- Sewal, archbishop, 172 [396]
- Sharp, archbishop, 393; is assassinated, 393
- Ship money, opposed by Hampden, 331
- Sicily and Roger Guiscard, 127
- Simeon, Charles, 464
- Societies for Reformation of Manners, 435; Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 435; Society for Propagation of the Gospel, 437; Church Missionary Society, 465; British and Foreign Bible Society, 464; National Society, 466; British and Foreign School Society, 472
- Socinianism had increased, 454
- Somerset, duke of, protector, builds Somerset house, 226
- Star chamber, account of, 296; is abolished, 346
- Statistics, amount given by the Church for schools, 475; amount given by it for churches and parsonage-houses, 475
- Stephen's reign, Romish encroachments, 142
- Stigand, archbishop of Canterbury, 106
- Stillington, 430
- Strafford, earl of, his trial, 344; he is condemned to death, his execution, 345
- Strongbow, earl of Pembroke, 140; marries Eva, made governor of Ireland, 147
- Suffragan bishops, 221, 476
- Sunday, observance of, 114
- Superintendents in place of bishops, system in Scotland, 269
- Supremacy, royal, 214; act of, 257
- Sweyn, his invasion, 105
- Synod of Vaison, 16; at Scone, 91; at Llandaff, 91; at Forfar, 93; at Cashel, 148; National, in London, 175
- TALIESIN and Merlin, 19
- Taylor, doctor Rowland, martyr, 240
- Tenison, archbishop of Canterbury, 430
- Tenth and first-fruits restored to the Church, 238; given back to the crown, 261
- Test act, 390
- Theodore, archbishop, 53; his death, 56
- Theodosius in Britain, 11
- Theodosius the Great, 11
- Tillotson succeeds Sancroft as archbishop of Canterbury, 419
- Tithes, remarks on, 82; and church dues, 98; Blackstone and Selden on, 112
- Title for holy orders required, 329
- Titles ecclesiastical restored in Scotland, 273
- Toleration, remarks on it by Calamy and others, 414; act of, passed in Scotland, 440
- Tonnage and poundage, 318, 346
- Tonstal, bishop, burns Tyndal's translation of Testament, 210
- Tracts for the Times*, 472
- Transubstantiation and Lanfranc, 130; confirmed at fourth council of Lateran, 162; formally adopted by English Church, 191
- Trent, council of, 230; its sittings renewed, 267
- Trial of the seven bishops, 409
- "Triers" appointed, 376
- Trinity college, grants given by James I., 311
- Tudor, Henry, earl of Richmond, becomes king Henry VII., and marries princess Elizabeth of York, 203
- Tyndal translates New Testament, 210; his death, 211
- Tyrannical proceedings of general assembly in Scotland, 423
- Tyranny shewn to clergy in Wales, 370
- Tyrconnell and the Irish army, 426
- ULSTER suffers from the rebellion, Scotch and other settlers there, Londonderry built, 310
- Uniformity, act of, 259, 387; remarks on it, 388; in Ireland, 399
- Union of Scotland, 432 [448]
- Universities, Scottish, when founded, 432
- Usher, archbishop of Armagh, 332; his death, 376
- VAISON, synod at, 16
- Villehad, 66
- Virgilius, 66
- Virgin Mary, worship of, immaculate conception, 142
- Virginia, British settlements there, 293
- Vortigern, 18

WALDENSES or Vaudois, 155

Wales, origin of the name, 20; Welsh did not help to Christianize Anglo-Saxons, 50; love of music, 140; chiefs at Strata Florida, 173; are subdued by Edward I., 178; dissensions checked; their improvement; account given by Giraldus, 180; insurrection of Owen Glendower, 194; ignorance and Romanism, 292; Bible and bishops Davies and Morgan, 293; bishop Parry's edition of Bible, Rev. Rhys Prichard, 312; hindrance to religion, itinerant preachers, Hugh Peters, Vavasor Powell, 370; falsehoods against clergy, 371; petition to parliament, colonel Freeman's remarks, 372; attached to the Stuarts, English bishops appointed, 430; after the commonwealth, 442; irreligion there, 458; quickness of Welsh children, 460; methodist lay preachers, 466; methodists separate from the Church, sketch of clergy and laity, dissenting Sunday schools, 467; dissent not then hostile to Church, Christmas Evans, 468; large amount of lay tithes; education fund, 469; eagerness for board schools, dissenters and religious education, 475

Wales, notices of, pp. 20, 29, 31, 34, 40, 50, 56, 78, 91, 94, 102, 107, 110, 115, 129, 132, 140, 149, 150, 156, 173, 177, 194, 292, 312, 359, 369, 430, 442, 458, 466

Walton, Isaak, 402

Wentworth, Sir Thomas, 314; sketch of, 323, made lord-deputy of Ireland, confers great benefits on Ireland, 333; recalled in 1640, 335; created earl of Strafford, 343

Wesley, John and Charles, 448; at Oxford, 449; preach in open air, wish to work with the Church, 450; their lay preachers, 451; their regular system, 452

Wesley, J., his letter to Sir J. Trelawny, 454; ordains ministers for America,

and some for Scotland, 455; his last declaration, his followers separate from the Church, 456

Wesley, Charles, disapproves of the ordinations, 456; his merits as a poet, 457

Wesleys, first annual conference, visit to Ireland, 452; sermon on the priestly office, separation decided in negative, 453; anticipate the views of our own day, 456

Westminster abbey, 107; rebuilt, 176

Whig and tory, names first used, 392

Whitby conference about Easter, 51

Whitfield at Oxford, 449; controversy with J. Wesley, 454; his powers of preaching, 457

Whitgift, archbishop of Canterbury, his letter to queen Elizabeth, 284; his death, 301

Wilberforce, Mr. W., his book published, Wilfrid and Colman, 51 [463]

Wilfred, bishop, 54

William, duke of Normandy, claims the English crown, 118; defeats Harold, 119; refuses homage to Gregory VII., 128; New Forest, 129; his death, 130

William II., 130; appoints Anselm archbishop of Canterbury, 131

William III., his principles, 417; wishes for toleration to episcopacy in Scotland, 422; his death, 431

William of Wykeham, 193

Williams, Rev. Isaac, 473

Willibrod, 65

Winfred, or Boniface, 65

Wishart, his martyrdom, 248

Witena-gemot, 60

Wolsey, cardinal, 209; his fall, 211

Works of supererogation, 154

Wycliffe, and John of Gaunt, 189; his translation of Bible, 191; his death, 192; opinions condemned, bones dug up, 197

YORK, duke of, 390

York, Thomas, archbishop of, 139



